Exploring the role of strategy instruction: Young learners' listening performance and strategy use

Pelin Irgin [a] * (iD), Ismail Hakki Erten [b] (iD)

[a] TED University, Ziya Gökalp Cad.No:48, Kolej, Ankara 06420, Turkey
[b] Hacettepe University, Egitim Fakultesi, Ingiliz Dili Egitim Anabilim Dalı, Beytepe Ankara 06800, Turkey

Abstract

This paper reports on an exploratory investigation into the impacts of implicit instruction of listening strategies on strategy use and listening performance of young EFL learners in Turkey. Data from 34 lower-intermediate learners of English in two-4th grade-classes in a primary school were analysed to investigate to what extent their employment of listening strategies varied after 12-week-strategy instruction integrated into their listening activities, and whether there was any change in their awareness of top-down and bottom-up processes in listening comprehension. Qualitative instruments of listening interviews were employed in the experimental and control groups to explore young learners' listening strategy use. Also, self-assessment grids and a pre- and post-test provided evidence of how the experimental group class had changed their reported strategy use and performance in listening comprehension. Analysis of the data revealed a difference in young learners' listening performance and strategy use over the examined time period, including a reported change in awareness of listening, increase in self-confidence, and a greater willingness to engage in strategy use. These findings are discussed in terms of the development in listening comprehension in English. This study implies that listening strategy instruction should be integrated in second language listening classroom to better young learners' listening.

Keywords: Listening comprehension; listening; strategy instruction; learner strategies; young learners

1. Introduction

It is widely agreed that L2/FL listening is a fundamental macro skill that requires time and effort to develop. Listening comprehension plays a crucial role for EFL learners in order to be active in the global community. However, teachers in various settings may overlook teaching their students how to listen (Geranpayeh & Taylor, 2013). Also, the covert nature of listening makes it difficult to understand students'

---

mental processes while listening. On the other hand, students may not realize that they must be active in their listening, and be strategic listeners. They may also fail to comprehend spoken language texts even though they listen to them twice and more. Therefore, one way to overcome the challenges in listening is to take attention from the traditional listening instruction to the student-oriented instruction, which suggests students to develop listening strategies (Chen, 2009).

Recent studies were conducted on L2/FL learners' listening strategies in various settings (Borhany et al., 2015; Chen, 2015; Graham et al., 2010; Liao & Yeldham, 2015; Simasangyaporn, 2016); however, there is a lack of research on both young learners' listening strategy use and their teachers' listening strategy intervention. To extend the limited research on strategy instruction for L2/FL young learners, this paper aimed to explore the role of implicit strategy instruction on young learners' listening performance and strategy use. Next, the findings gathered from the methodological issues within the listening strategy instruction investigating listening strategies deployed by the young learners are discussed. Finally, this paper concludes by arguing both pedagogical and methodological implications of listening strategy instruction to make more-aware young listeners.

1.1. L2/FL Listening as an Interactive Process

Listening in L2/FL is considered an active and complex process, where various mechanisms interact at different levels. L2 listeners are believed to follow a language process following neurological and linguistic paths (namely, decoding the incoming input for bottom-up processing), as well as semantic and pragmatic processing for meaning making purposes (activation of schemata for bottom-up processing), or pass through an interactive process (for both bottom up and top-down) (Field, 2014; Wilson, 2010).

Integration of approaches both bottom-up processing and top-down processing referring to interactive processing are often of pertinence to more pedagogic models for knowledge construction in L2 listening (Chen, 2015; Field, 2008). Listeners can benefit from both bottom-up and top-down processing through an interactive processing (Graham & Santos, 2013) as these rather seemingly discrete mechanisms can be complimentary to each other. Macaro et al. (2015) put this interplay clearly in their example: "When we read that the train manager checked the passengers' tickets, we receive congruent evidence from both the form of the word-tickets (bottom-up) and from our knowledge of what the train manager is likely to be doing (top-down)" (p.35). Such an interactive model of listening comprehension underlines individualized, contextualized, critical, inter-textual, strategic, cross-cultural, and social-affective dimensions (Flowerdew & Miller, 2005). In this respect, to explore the impact of implicit strategy instruction in listening, both bottom-up and top-down approaches were integrated to the instruction in this present study.

1.2. Strategic Listening in L2/FL

The covert nature of listening comprehension compared to the other language skills (i.e. speaking, reading and writing), makes it complicated to allude how knowledge is processed and what strategies are used. Rost (2011) defines strategic listening as the unity of basic prerequisites having awareness on good listening text, authentic and pedagogic speech, and different listening text types and processes.

In the discussion of how strategic listening might be defined, Macaro (2006) explains that strategic listening requires a conscious mental employment to achieve a specific learning goal in listening comprehension and its conveyance to other listening tasks. Besides, strategic listeners apply to their knowledge that guides to the use of both cognitive (i.e. predicting and guessing) and metacognitive strategies (i.e. awareness and control) (Goh, 2002; Graham et al., 2010; Vandergrift, 2003; Yeldham & Gruba, 2014). Thus, to have strategic behaviour, L2/FL listeners need to know how sources of knowledge are applied as well as what type of knowledge sources are deployed in various circumstances.

Numerous studies (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Goh, 2002; Grenfell & Macaro, 2007; Macaro, 2006) have been conducted on investigating learners' listening strategy employment and the effectiveness of clusters/combinations of listening strategies. Vandergrift (2003) has provided a general view on listening strategies used by L2/FL listeners and classified strategic listeners as more and less proficient listeners. Graham et al. (2010) and Macaro (2006) defend that strategic learners manage foreign language learning process through the use of metacognitive strategies. They claim that learners perform better in listening tasks if they make better use of metacognitive strategies. This is because of the strategic listeners' ability to select and discard the clustered strategies rigorously based on the changing tasks and goals. Therefore, strategic listeners are likely to employ a set of strategies to meet a specific learning outcome. This is explained by Macaro (2006, p.329) as "*if* in a learning situation, task is X, *and* when the learning goal is Y, *then* try mental action Z". The above literature review presents certain patterns and evidences about how strategies develop or their use change with young adults and adult learners. However, we still have insufficient evidence about how young learners can be strategic listeners with the implicit instruction of listening strategies. Thus, the present study will contribute to ascertain how and to what extent strategy instruction make young learners aware of their listening process.

1.3. Listening Strategy Instruction Models

Strategy instruction provides listeners options to deal with their comprehension difficulties, to compensate for their comprehension breakdowns (Field, 2008; Liao & Yeldham, 2015), and to better their listening comprehension process. This also includes the employment of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies in addition to the combination of both top-down and bottom-up processing for comprehension in L2/FL listening. However, Graham et al. (2014) indicated that teachers found listening difficult to teach, which is controversial for learners, as well (Graham et al.,

2010). Likewise, Cohen (2003) proposed goals of listening strategy instruction to nurture autonomous learning. To foster learner autonomy, it is important to understand learners' needs for learning a new language and to determine the common problems they have. In order for learners to be active in their learning process, teachers and instructors often promote strategy use in all language skills (Graham, 2011; Rost, 2011). According to Field (2008), teachers adopt "comprehension approach" (p.26) that is mainly adopted through listening practices in the process. This approach was adopted in many countries and cultures, but very little attention is basically given on the process of listening and how to listen.

Besides, for listening strategies instruction, Chen (2009) proposed a strategy-based approach which provided in-class strategy awareness-raising, demonstrating, practicing, discussing, and out-of-class self-reflection in their listening. In her study, reflective journals increased the students' self-awareness and control of listening strategies. Then, Liao and Yeldham (2015) put strategy instruction in their study similarly, and they supported that strategies instruction contributed to learners improve their self-control, self-awareness, and self-confidence by decreasing their anxiety. The literature on strategy instruction models (Chamot, 1995; Cohen, 2003) show the similar rationale and implementation for the instruction such as identifying strategies and enhancing meta-cognition, practicing the selected strategies, discussing the use of strategies in pre-while-post stages, and encouraging for self-reflection. This is regarded as motivating for students to do strategy-transfers in their other listening tasks.

In addition, the strategy instruction model introduced by Ellis (2008) including three stages: the strategic-awareness raising phase, demonstration phase, practice phase, reflection phase, is based on raising awareness of students on their preferences. At this point, it can be noted that strategy instruction not only promotes learner autonomy but also motivates learners to use strategies out of the classroom. Further, Anderson (2009) provided a different strategy instruction model processing the information in three stages: perception, parsing, and utilization, through which learners reflected their mental representation in their listening comprehension process. Such a cognitive processing is crucial for language teachers to understand the needs of their students in listening process. Thus, this suggests a great deal to understand whether strategy instruction leads to positive contributions for students' listening performance and learning in L2/FL. The strategy instruction model for listening proposed by Graham (2017) was applied in the strategy intervention sessions as well. The rationale for strategy instruction approach was to observe the listening problems of the students, to match the strategies to problems, and to make students receptive to the listening strategy instruction. It included a sub training, which was called "ear training" (Graham & Macaro, 2008). Strategy instruction was presented as (I) Preparation for listening: Awareness-raising as an introduction to core strategies, (II) Listening-task: Modelling and practice of core strategies (reflection, evaluation and feedback), (III) Post-listening: Gradual fading out of reminders (practice, reflection and evaluation).

1.4. Young EFL learners

Empirical research with young learners of English on strategy instruction in primary education is scarce and much of it comes from the studies conducted to ESL/EFL learners in secondary and high school level education (Liao & Yeldham, 2015; Macaro et al., 2015). Among this body of research, Graham et al. (2010) have offered convincing findings on how to develop learners' linguistics and strategic knowledge in L2/FL listening to improve their proficiency. To reveal the contribution of strategy instruction apparently, lower-intermediate learners of French in high school in England were taught listening without being receiving explicit strategy instruction (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Graham et al., 2010). Their findings revealed that the participants were often inadequate in the use of listening strategies and maintained their listening problems.

Many theorists and practitioners advocated numerous strategy instruction models including a balanced approach to make young EFL learners and young adolescents become strategic listeners (Field, 2008; Graham, 2011, Vandergrift, 2007). Mareschal (2007), in a study of eight adolescents - Canadian learners of French- following a metacognitive approach, asserted the learners increased their top-down strategies to compensate their weaknesses in listening and improved bottom-up information processing by identifying key terms in listening and inferencing more. Further, Chen's (2015) research on the impacts of strategy instruction on strategy use of Taiwanese college students showed positive change in using listening strategies, self-directed learning and listening performance. In Chen's (2009) previous study, strategy instruction in a context of Taiwanese 31 technological college students, students reported much more self-control and awareness on listening strategies. Therefore, Mareschal (2007) and Chen (2015) imply the integration of strategy instruction in the EFL listening curriculum to help young adult learners become effective listeners.

Another line of studies (Graham et al., 2010; Santos et al., 2008; Goh & Taib, 2006) proposed discussions investigating listening strategies deployed by learners in secondary schools. Goh and Taib (2006) investigated the impact of strategy instruction for a group of young learners in a three-stage listening sequence: listen-answer, reflect, and report-discuss without testing its validity with a control group. Students' self-reports and listening test scores revealed that strategy instruction was beneficial for the less proficient learners. Further, Graham et al. (2010) examined whether the listening strategy employments and knowledge sources varied according to the students of French in four secondary schools in England. There was evidence that the learners over-relied on their linguistic and world knowledge in L2 listening comprehension. Finally, as Santos et al. (2008) referred in their research project investigating both writing and listening strategies of secondary school students in the South of England, high linguistic knowledge and word recognition were highly related to being strategic listeners and writers, which was not valid for all students. From these findings, it was still unclear at what level students might achieve strategic listening. Yet much of these studies (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift &

Tafaghodtari, 2010; Yeldham & Gruba, 2014) have outlined the benefits of strategy instruction to young adult learners and adolescents, rather than young learners in primary education. Therefore, from the ongoing review on strategy instruction, there appears to be a number of questions gauging the impact of strategy use on listening performance for identifying more or less strategic young listeners.

1.5. Research Questions

This study was primarily concerned with investigating the listening strategies employed by Turkish young EFL learners in primary education. It also aimed to explore the relationship between listening strategy instruction and young learners' use of listening strategies and their achievement in L2/FL listening. The study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. What listening strategies are used by the EFL primary school Turkish students during listening?
2. Does strategy instruction expand the EFL primary school Turkish students' use of listening strategies?
3. Does strategy instruction improve the EFL primary school level Turkish students' listening proficiency?

2. Method

2.1. Participants

34 Turkish EFL primary school students with homogenous EFL learning backgrounds participated in this study. All participants were at the age of 10 and 4th grade level. They have learnt English in the same school setting for three years, and their proficiency level was A2. The students were randomly assigned as the experimental, consisting of 15 students, and the control group, 19 students. The experimental group students received strategy instruction implicitly by following the strategy instruction model, while control group attended their foreign language class without taking any strategy instruction. Additionally, ethics approval and parent consent forms were shared with the parents of the participants as they were young. Also, it was ethically informed if experimental group gets beneficial treatment and the control group does not, then the treatment will be offered to the control group at the end of the research.

2.2. Strategy Instruction

A volunteer English teacher teaching to the 4th grade students in primary school was informed about the 12-week strategy intervention process. Both experimental and control groups were taught by the same teacher. Course book used in face to face classroom environment was Macmillan English Quest 4 by Corbett and O'Farrell (2013). The researchers revealed listening strategies embedded in various kinds of

pre-while- and post-listening tasks such as matching, filling the blanks, finding true-false sentences, and answering the multiple choice questions in the course book. The clustered strategies in the listening tasks reflecting the course objectives and fostering listening comprehension were both metacognitive (planning, monitoring, self-evaluation, selective attention, directed attention) and cognitive (inferencing, word recognition, use of person knowledge, use of task knowledge, prediction, visualization, imagery, summarization) (Field, 2008; Goh & Taib, 2006; Graham & Santos, 2015; Macaro et al., 2016; Oxford, 2001).

Prior to actual strategy instruction, a training on listening strategies interventions and the use of instruments, was given to the English teacher. The teacher used the same listening materials, practices and assessment tools for both groups. In the control group, traditional teaching methods and approaches in listening was followed by the teacher. It basically involved pre-, while- and post-listening exercises provided in the course book, and the teacher did not inform control group students about strategy use. However, the only difference between both groups was the strategy intervention including awareness-raising listening activities and self-assessment grids applied to the experimental group.

In every strategy instruction session, the English teacher modelled awareness-raising activities and a set of strategies grounded in listening tasks to be effective for unidirectional listening process. Metacognitive and cognitive strategies were taught implicitly in the strategy instruction sessions weekly 2 hours (around 80 minutes). As the nature of listening tasks in the course book did not require the use of social/affective listening strategies, they were not included in the strategy instruction sessions. As the students were young learners (age of 10) at the concrete operational stage, they were informed about what to do and how to listen in pre-while and post listening processes without using the technical terms "strategy", "metacognitive", or "cognitive". Even though student at this stage are very concrete and literate, they start to use their logic and to share their thoughts and feelings. Thus, the students in the experimental group were implicitly familiarized with metacognitive strategies used in pre-listening (planning), while listening (self-monitoring, selective attention, directed attention) and post listening (self-evaluation) processes. Also cognitive strategies were directly involved in the listening tasks and purposefully shared for understanding the listening task demands. They included prediction, visualization, inferencing, word recognition, use of person knowledge and task knowledge, imagery and summarization. Furthermore, in order to let students gain strategic behaviours and facilitate use of strategies for listening comprehension systematically, self-assessment grids were distributed to the experimental group students after they complete the listening tasks in the classroom.

In this study, the strategy instruction model proposed by Graham (2017) was applied in the listening strategy intervention sessions. The rationale for strategy instruction approach was to observe the experimental group students in their listening process, to understand the problems they have faced in listening, to match the strategies with the problems, and to make students receptive to the listening

strategy instruction. It also included a sub training, which was called "ear training" (Graham & Macaro, 2008). The strategy instruction phases were summarized as follows:

(I)   **Awareness-raising phase:** An introduction to core strategies

_Teacher raised the strategic awareness of the students by modelling and employing awareness raising listening activities.

(II)   **Modelling and practice of core strategies:** Reflection, evaluation and feedback

_Teacher displayed pre-listening task, let students do matching and have a review on the listening comprehension questions, and gave insights how to use clues to achieve well in listening comprehension and to deal with their problems in listening.

_Teacher showed what listening strategies might be used, each strategy was specified implicitly based on the task demands.

_Experimental group listened to the task, and then completed the self-assessment grid.

_Teacher gave a brief feedback on what the listening task was about and which strategies were used.

Reflection probes:

_What did you understand?

Purpose: Confirm comprehension

_What helped you to understand the text?

Purpose: Elicit task knowledge (factors that influenced listening)

_What prevented you from getting the correct answers?

Purpose: Elicit task knowledge (factors that influenced listening)

_What did you do to understand as much of the text as possible?

Purpose: Elicit strategy knowledge (strategies for facilitating listening)

(III)   **Gradual fading out of reminders:** Practice, reflection and evaluation).

_Teacher reminded the strategies that help them to deal with the listening problems.

_Students dealt with the pre-listening task requirements.

_Teacher asked them what their initial hypotheses are about the text.

_Students listened to the text and filled in their assessment grids.

_Teacher took sheets and wrote very brief feedback on range and combination of strategies used, to be returned in strategies instruction session.

In addition to the in-class strategy instruction, experimental group students were encouraged to use self-assessment grids for their listening activities outside classroom setting. Its purpose was to foster learners' strategic behaviour by much more practices and to increase their awareness on self-assessment in listening.

2.3. Instruments

Multiple measurements were used to collect sets of data in this study. The qualitative instruments of semi-structured interviews, and the quantitative instruments, pre-post tests were used for both experimental and control groups, while self-assessments grids and strategy instruction were only given to the experimental group.

Listening comprehension test included in the course book (Corbett & O'Farrell, 2013) was used as pre- and post-tests to measure participants' listening proficiency. The test was developed by Macmillan Education with high reliability and validity. The test included four parts: Part 1) Before-listening (matching pictures with the words), Part 2) While-listening (listening and note-taking), Part 3) While-listening (listening and choosing true-false), and Part 4) After-listening (match the pictures with the correct sentences). Pre-test was administered to both control and experimental group before the academic term. After the 12th week process, both groups were tested with the same test to determine and compare the listening levels. The listening text was presented twice and all testing process took nearly 20 minutes.

Semi-structured interviews were used to investigate the participants' listening strategy use as a phenomenon (Husserl, 1931). Each interview lasted approximately 15-20 minutes and was conducted following an open framework. It was used with 10 randomly chosen participants (among 4 high achievers-3 moderate achievers-3 low achievers in listening tasks) in the experimental group and control group and it was carried out in the participants' native language (Turkish) following the post-test. The voice recorded interviews aimed to elicit deep information from the participants on their self-reported listening comprehension processes using immediate retrospection. They were asked what they thought before-, while- and after-listening; what contributed to their listening comprehension; how they made sense of what they listened to; whether pictures visualized in their minds; if yes, what they were; how they dealt with unfamiliar and new words; and how they could figure out the problems when they had in listening. In the interviews, each interviewee was encouraged to reflect their listening comprehension and a stress-free environment was created. The data collected from the audio-recorded interviews were transcribed and translated from Turkish to English.

The self-assessment grid designed by Graham and Irgin (2017) was used to evaluate the participants' listening strategy use, to check strategies that help them understand what they listen to in English. It included 11 metacognitive and cognitive listening strategy items. These could be listed as (1) predicting the lexis to understand the text, (2) making a real effort to catch the gist of the text; (3) checking that their predictions make sense, (4) checking prediction and changed them if necessary, (5) tiring to do mental visualization when they lose their attention, (6) using other cues such as pictures, video records, music and animated sounds, (7) trying to keep their mental concentration up when they lose it, (8) writing down some points not to forget after listening, (9) using their common sense, own experience and world knowledge, (10) using logic to work out a word's meaning, and (11) using their knowledge of Turkish words.

2.4. Data Analysis

The qualitative data was analyzed through phenomenological data analysis steps (Moustakas, 1994) including delimiting to invariant horizons or meaning units, clustering the invariant constituents into themes, individual textual and individual structural descriptions, composite structural descriptions, and synthesis of textural and structural meanings and essences. The data reported in the interviews were coded by both researchers independently and then compared with the codes of the other researcher specialized in the field of language learning and listening strategies. The inter-coding and intra-coding included checking the segmentation and coding of the transcriptions. The statistical similarity analysis of coding revealed very high agreement between two coders (.92, *p<.001*) as over .80 values represent very high agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977). Any disagreements in coding were resolved through discussion.

Independent samples *t*-test and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were used to determine whether there was a meaningful difference between experimental group and control group on listening strategy use and listening proficiency based on strategy instruction.

3. Results

Research question 1: What listening strategies are used by the EFL primary school Turkish students during listening?

The results of the data analysis showed that all students in both groups deployed both metacognitive and cognitive strategies in different percentages for their listening comprehension. It was obviously obtained from the self-assessment grids of the EFL primary school Turkish students that the cognitive strategies were used with higher frequency compared to the metacognitive strategies.

Table 1. Frequency of listening strategies used at the onset

Listening strategies	Frequency (N=34)	Cumulative Percent
CS-I have used other clues such as pictures, video records, music and animated sounds. (Item 6)	25	74%
CS-I have predicted the lexis to understand the text. (Item 1)	22	65%
CS-I have tried to do mental visualization again when I lose my attention. (Item 5)	22	65%
CS & MS-I have checked my prediction and changed them if necessary. (Item 4)	21	62%
CS-I have used my knowledge of Turkish words. (Item 11)	21	62%
CS-I have used logic to work out a word's meaning. (Item 10)	20	59%
CS-I have used my common sense, my own experience, my world knowledge. (Item 9)	19	56%
MS-I have checked that my interpretations make sense. (Item 3)	18	53%
MS-I have made a real effort to catch the gist of the text. (Item 2)	15	44%
MS-I have tried to keep my mental concentration up when I lose it. (Item 7)	13	38%

CS-I have written down some points not to forget after listening. (Item 8)	8	24%

(MS: Metacognitive strategies; CS: Cognitive strategies)

Table 1 revealed that both group students were already using cognitive strategies in listening in various percentages. Among the subcategories of the cognitive listening strategies, the students use visualization (Item 6, 74%), prediction (Item 1, 65%), imagery (Item 5, 65%), word-recognition (Item 11, 62%), inferencing (Item 10, 59%), use of person knowledge (Item 9, 56%). Also, the results indicated that the students used metacognitive strategies; self-monitoring (Item 4, 62%), self-evaluation (Item 3, 53%), and directed attention (Item 2, 44%). Summarization (Item 8, 24%) was less frequently used compared to the other listening strategies. It supported the idea that there was a need for the instruction of metacognitive strategies to the students to make them more aware on their listening comprehension process.

Research question 2: Does strategy instruction expand the EFL primary school Turkish students' use of listening strategies?

The results of the independent samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in listening strategy use in the beginning and at the end of the strategy instruction between the experimental group and the control group. As shown in Table 2, the *Sig.* (2-tailed) value was .008, which is below the cut off of .05. While the raw mean value for the employment of listening strategies in control group was 6.47, the mean for the use of LSs in the experimental group was 8.46, which showed the group difference at the onset of the treatment. Also, statistically measured the listening strategies were employed at higher level at the end of the listening instruction process among the experimental group students (*M*=10.80) compared to the control group members (*M*=4.94). It is important to add that there was no systematic increase in the listening strategy employment in the control group.

Table 2. Independent samples t-test

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	df	Sig.	Mean Difference
Strategies used at the onset of strategy instruction	Control group	19	6.47	1.77540	-2.836	32	.008	-1.99
	Experimental group	15	**8.46**	2.32584				
Strategies used at the end of strategy instruction	Control group	19	4.94	1.68238	-12.043	32	.000	-5.85
	Experimental group	15	**10.80**	.94112				

To explore the impact of the strategy instruction and the given possibility that the students in different groups varied in the numerous of given strategies employed, the analysis of covariance was employed a number of strategies used by each learners at the onset of the study is covariant. The results can be seen below:

Table 3. Univariate analysis of variance

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Strategies used at the end of the strategy instruction

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	294.792[a]	2	147.396	82.066	.000	.841
Intercept	81.851	1	81.851	45.572	.000	.595
Group	193.393	1	193.393	107.676	.000	.776
Strategies used at the onset	7.669	1	7.669	4.270	.047	.121
Error	55.678	31	1.796			
Total	2278.000	34				
Corrected Total	350.471	33				

a. R Squared = .841 (Adjusted R Squared = .831)

Estimated Marginal Means

Dependent Variable: Strategies used at the end of the strategy instruction

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control group	5.159[a]	.324	4.498	5.820
Experimental group	10.532[a]	.370	9.778	11.286

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Strategies = 7.3529.

Additionally, the qualitative findings of the research revealed a difference in young learners' listening performance and strategy use over the presented time period, tending the focus on (1) satisfaction with the strategy instruction, (2) change in awareness, (3) increase in self-confidence, and (4) willingness to use listening strategies.

Satisfaction with the strategy instruction addressed to the achievement of the experimental group students as a result of listening strategy instruction. The use of listening strategy as a phenomenon was examined in three different processes which led to the achievement of the target group in their listening comprehension. The listening process in the treatment group was examined as before-listening, while-listening and after-listening, which formed a basis for the success of the treatments. The students in the experimental group reported that each process had different requirements and the instructions. Each of them obviously contributed to their success in the listening comprehension. 86.6% (13 students among 15) of the experimental group students stated that the treatment on the listening strategy instruction contributed to their listening comprehension process. For example, St6 said, *"I started to get higher scores in my listening exams and my teacher taught me what to do before listening and during listening."* St6 also reported what points contributed to her success in the listening comprehension process. She stated:

To achieve well in listening comprehension task, I followed up my teachers' instructions. Errr....Before listening, I used the pictures and predicted what the

topic of listening task might be. Well... I got happy when I understood it. I was able to do it successfully because I guessed and my prediction was correct.

Other students in the experimental group shared their views about the use of listening strategies in the pre-listening process in order to increase their success in listening comprehension. 80% of them shared how the use of clues expanded their viewpoints and guided them before listening. One of the participants in the experimental group, St14 clearly mentioned about this process as cited below:

I am good at listening comprehension. I understand very well. Its reason is I follow the ways my teacher taught me. Before listening… our teacher gives us worksheets and I am trying to understand the topic by using the visuals first. Sometimes there are some words…I use them all while listening…. Well…I always make an effort to be successful....I am successful.

Similarly, the quotes spelled out by the students St9 and St4 clearly supported the contribution of the treatment in their listening comprehension achievement:

St9: The pre-listening activity helped me a lot. I listened to the words that I had seen in my worksheet. Our teacher told me that the clues got me ready for the listening task….I used her instructions. Then, I achieved.

St4: I am successful now... I learn at school very well and I do listening at home as well. Before listening, I follow the instructions that my teacher taught. All of them are helpful.

Apart from the pre-listening process, the listening strategy instructions on while and after listening process have contributions to the experimental group students. 93.3% of the experimental group students (14 students) reported that nearly each listening strategy component had contributions to their success in listening comprehension. The students also commented on the importance of the listening strategy use during listening and after listening processes. It is understood that the treatment applied in the academic term made a real challenge for the students and encouraged them to use listening strategies. When they tried to use listening strategies to understand the listening task, they successfully completed the listening comprehension process. It seemed that the listening strategy instruction had a motivating effect on the students' achievement. This view was spelled out by the experimental group students in different ways.

St3 added the reasons for his achievement in listening comprehension process. As it is understood from his quote, he used listening strategies when he has listening breakdowns, which leads his success in the listening process:

When I lose my attention while listening, I focus on listening again….I continue to the listening task by relating the sections in the story.

Additionally, reflecting upon the importance of prediction in listening process, St8 said:

> *I check my predictions….If it is okay, I continue listening. …Sometimes I realize that it is different from my prediction. ..Then, I try to understand the listening task... I see that I succeed when I respond to the questions of my teacher correctly.*

As seen from the reference above, the participant hints the possibility of the change in prediction in listening process. When the participant checks his prediction and changes it if necessary, he completes the listening process without insisting on his predictions. By following the listening strategies applied in the treatment, the student explains the contribution of the treatment to the success in the listening comprehension process.

To conclude, the students in the experimental group experienced success both during the listening strategy instruction and at the end of the process. Each student in the experimental group was impressed by the listening strategy intervention, and its impact on success was reflected in the students' reports. Also, based on the teacher observations, the student to student dialogs in the classroom environment and the teacher to student communication in the instruction environment showed that experimental group students had positive attitude on using listening strategies in case of listening comprehension problems. Whenever they faced listening difficulties in the process, they expressed their concerns and encouraged each other to use listening strategies to success.

Change in awareness was the second code referring to change in experimental group students' awareness on the use of listening strategies when they need to come over listening difficulties or problems. Students' responses in the experimental group indicated that the listening strategy instruction helped them change their awareness as listeners. The treatment they received taught them how to do listening and what to do when they have problems in listening. In accordance with the listening task demands, the experimental group students revised their understanding about listening process by following listening phases and listening strategies.

In the experimental group, there were changes in the students' awareness about the use of listening strategy not to deter them from listening when they have gaps in listening process. 66.6% of the students voiced their views about how they changed their ways in listening comprehension process. 10 of the experimental group students reported that the instruction their teachers had applied in the classroom environment led to achievement in listening process and they have started to use the similar or same way while they were listening to English texts out of the classroom environment. The self-assessment grids that their teachers had given them to encourage for the use of listening strategies convinced them to use each listening strategy automatically. For instance, St10 shared her ideas as below:

> *I used to start listening process without following steps that my teacher taught me but now I know what I should do.*

Also, St11 explained that through the treatment she learnt a lot and did better in listening comprehension tasks. She added:

I know what to do. I do listening activities at home on my own. If there are pictures, I look at them before listening and try to predict the topic.

St5 expressed his ideas about the listening strategy instruction process and the use of listening strategies in different processes as the following:

I know what to do while I am listening. I am using the knowledge that I have learned in the classroom…Err…Sometimes…there are some parts I misunderstand. At that time I use pictures, animated sounds in the listening task. I guess the topic…While I do listening, I guess for what comes next.

The same viewpoint was revealed by St8. He stated that he listened to the texts carefully and paid attention to understand the words very well.

Moreover, seven students reported that their awareness on the listening task demands and listening phases increased after the listening strategy intervention. St12 expressed her awareness on the use of listening strategy as she stated:

I always use the self-assessment grid to check what I have done in listening process... Well...I know now what to do because my teacher usually uses the same paper in the classroom...But sometimes I forget to use some of them.

St9 pinpointed that through the listening strategy instruction she learned that there are same phases for all listening tasks, but the topics might be different. However, the main purpose of the listening tasks and the listening comprehension questions are mostly following the same intention to check the students' achievement by saying:

…Now I know that there are same phases in listening. Before listening, I predict the topic. I use pictures and words if there are. Sometimes… when I do not understand what the speakers say I use my logic to understand the text…Err…When I answer the listening comprehension questions, I do all of them correct, which makes me very happy.

To sum up, the experimental group students seemed to raise their awareness on the use of listening strategies and they have individual effort to achieve the listening process by following their teachers' instructions. They rely on their teachers' instruction and they believe that the listening strategy instruction process contributed to their change towards listening strategy use.

Increase in self-**confidence** was the third code indicating how confidently the students used listening strategies in their listening comprehension, how the improvements in their listening performance motivated them and increased their self-confidence. The more they achieve in the listening comprehension task based on the listening strategy instruction, the more they appear to trust themselves. Beside the treatment they received, the personal employments of listening strategies in the learning environment fostered listening strategy use. 53.3% (8 students) in the experimental group reported that they relied on themselves in foreign language listening process as well as showing a desire to achieve more. For example, St4 highlighted the raise in her self-confidence by adding that she was good at listening in

English and became more confident after she followed what her teacher taught in the classroom. Similarly, St14 said:

I am good at listening...I use my logic and understand the listening texts in English. It is very easy to understand.

The same view was spelled out by St13:

I know how to listen in order to understand. I speak English with my auntie and she says me that I speak English very well...Well...I listen to English texts at school and I speak English with my teacher.

Moreover, students in the experimental group reflected the increase in their self confidence in daily conversation with their family members. St1 and St3 shared their self-confidence adding that they had more confidence after the listening strategy instruction applied in the classroom environment. St1 said:

I have friends from the USA and I play games with them. My mum said me that I had improved my speaking ability. I got very happy as she realized my achievement in English.

St3 also expressed his fathers' intense fascination on his listening performance in English which raised his self-confidence:

I watch movies in English at home with my family. One day we were watching a film again....After we watched it, my mother asked some questions about the film...As I understood the main idea of the film, I responded to her questions....I think both my parents are proud of me...My father said me that he realized the change in my listening skill...Err... I have started to believe myself more.

To conclude, half of the students in the experimental group (53.3%) seemed to think that they gained self-confidence as a consequence of the listening instruction process. The treatment they received fostered their belief to themselves and reshaped their attitudes to the listening strategy use and their roles in the listening process. They realized that there were changes in the personal roles as listeners. It seemed clearly that their self-confidence would increase more day by day when they got more responsibilities for their own listening process with the use of listening strategies.

Willingness to use LSs represented that the students were ready and willing to continue the listening strategy use whenever they do listening comprehension tasks. As the listening strategy instruction had contributions to the students such as developing independence, fostering confidence, improving listening performance; almost most of the students in the experimental group (13 students, 86.6%) reported their satisfaction on the use of listening strategy and their desire to use them in future. For example, St4 listed her achievements by highlighting her already built willing for the use of listening strategies:

I am good at listening in English...Err...I have learned a lot at school and I am using them while I am listening to English at home.

Also, St15 stated that she had future plans for the use of listening strategies that were taught as a part of the intervention process. This was clear in her quote:

This summer I will go abroad for holiday if I achieve well in my English course…. I am sure that I will go…. because now I know how to do in listening…

Moreover, some students have already determined to continue using listening strategies in their out of class activities such as playing computer games, watching movies, listening to English songs. Here are some comments of the experimental group students:

St7: I am good at listening in English…I have a lot of friends with whom I play computer games…Err…most of them speak English while playing games…Before…I could hardly understand their speech…but now I play better as I understand them better…I will win by using the clues in the games.

St12: I am planning to use some clues such as pictures, music and animated sounds in the movies when I do not understand the words.

St3: Before I start this English course, I used to understand some of what is said in English… listening activities…Then, my teacher taught us…I always want to be successful.

Also, the students in the experimental group as similar to the control group students enjoy listening to music in English. Some students said that they were eager to understand the lyrics of the songs, which might be regarded as a motivation for future listening independently. In fact, the songs presented in their student books as a part of curriculum might be an awareness-raising activity. For instance, St4 said that:

I benefited a lot from what my teacher taught in English courses…By using words only, I can understand the gist of the text… I like listening to music in English… Even I use words to work out the meaning...Well…now…I enjoy more.

To sum up, the way the students expressed themselves was a reflection of willingness to use listening strategies. Conceptually, it might be difficult to define and call the term strategy as they are young learners; however, the phrase "what my teacher taught" refers to the use of listening strategy use. Each listening strategy construct had an influence on their future plans to continue their listening performance and even increase their employments of listening strategies to deal with the problems or difficulties in listening comprehension process.

Research question 3: Does strategy instruction improve the EFL primary school level Turkish students' listening proficiency?

As for the pre-test, it was found out that there was a statistically significant difference in listening performance between the experimental group and control group (*Sig.*2-tailed: .010, significant at *p<.05*).

Table 4. Independent samples *t*-test

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig.
Pre-test	Control group	19	61.57	10.93575	-2.719	32	.010
	Experimental group	15	72.33	12.08108			
Post-test	Control group	19	63.15	13.96529	-5.635	32	.000
	Experimental group	15	86.93	9.50539			

In this study, ANCOVA was used as there was a two-group pre-test and post-test design to compare the impact of two different interventions, taking before and after measures for each group. The students' mean scores of pre-test was treated as a covariate to control for pre-existing differences between the groups, which made ANCOVA very useful when there was quite small sample sizes and medium size effect.

ANCOVA was conducted to compare the effectiveness of two different interventions designed to increase awareness and use of listening comprehension strategies. The dependent variable was the type of intervention (listening comprehension strategies), and the dependent variable consisted of scores on the pre-test and post-test administered before and after the intervention was applied. Participants' scores on the pre-intervention administration were used as the covariate in this analysis. Preliminary checks were conducted to ensure that there was no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression slopes, and reliable measurement of the covariate. After adjusting the pre-intervention scores, there was a significant difference between the control group and the experimental group on post-test scores on listening comprehension, $p = .00$, and partial eta square = .705.

Table 5. Univariate analysis of variance

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	6711.763[a]	2	3355.882	37.128	.000	.705
Intercept	772.479	1	772.479	8.546	.006	.216
Pre-test	1973.458	1	1973.458	21.833	.000	.413
Group	1831.394	1	1831.394	20.262	.000	.395
Error	2802.001	31	90.387			
Total	193926.000	34				
Corrected Total	9513.765	33				

a. *R* Squared = .705 (Adjusted *R* Squared = .686)

Estimated Marginal Means				
Dependent Variable: Post-test				
Groups	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control group	66.412[a]	2.290	61.742	71.081
Experimental group	82.812[a]	2.608	77.492	88.132
a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre-test = 66.3235.				

4. Discussions

In the reviews of strategy training, there are various studies on reading (Dreyer & Nel, 2003), writing (De Silva & Graham, 2015), listening (Nakatani, 2005), and speaking. However, there is still no consensus for the both positive and negative impacts of strategy instruction for all language areas in different culture contexts (Plonsky, 2011). In Plonsky's (2011) meta-analysis on strategy instruction research, listening comprehension skill is the least frequently studied in the field of applied linguistics and five out of 61 research aimed to search on listening comprehension and listening strategy instruction, which shows the need on listening comprehension and strategy intervention more. The findings of this study confirmed that listening strategy instruction encouraged young learners to use both cognitive and metacognitive strategies with the aid of awareness raising activities on listening strategies. With increasing awareness on strategy use implicitly, young learners seems to be able to control over their listening.

Simasangyaporn's research (2016) showed that the intervention group incorporated a wider range of top-down strategies with bottom-up strategies, and were able to select and discard strategies as required at the end of the intervention process. The intervention group participants showed the greater change in strategy use. The most outstanding changes were found in metacognitive strategies such as hypothesis confirmation and problem identification while hypothesis formation, identification of words and vocalisation were followed among the cognitive strategies. Similarly, the findings of this research showed that the experimental group students could use both cognitive and metacognitive strategies in listening comprehension such as visualization, prediction, imagery, word-recognition, inferencing, use of person knowledge, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and directed attention. They could improve an awareness on the incorporation of cognitive strategies with the metacognitive ones. As a support to the findings of this research, Field (2008) regards the use of top-down strategies of listeners as compensator for the incomplete bottom-up information. In Graham and Macaro's study (2008), the participants combined the cognitive strategies; prediction, directed attention, phonemic segmentation, inferencing and verification, with metacognitive strategies such as monitoring and evaluation.

Moreover, a number of studies have focused on the individually top-down strategies such as inferencing, prediction and elaboration rather than focusing on problem solution based strategic approach (Macaro et al., 2015). However, recent strategy

intervention studies have started to address positive results of strategy instruction embedded into the language learning programmes. For example, Graham and Macaro (2008) evaluated a listening strategy intervention program with 197 lower intermediate learners of French studying in totally 15 secondary schools. Learners were divided into two groups as high scaffolding, 68 participants in total, and low scaffolding, 39 students. As the nature of the strategy intervention programme, the initial strategic behaviours of learners were investigated with a diagnostic approach and then, both top-down and bottom-up strategies were included into the programme. Intervention group received instruction in French symbol-sound correspondences to raise their awareness on pronunciation in L2 listening. However, the results based on the listening comprehension tests and self-efficacy questionnaire, were mixed in respect of different scaffolding levels of participants listening outcomes. Additionally, Goh (2000) reveals the importance of helping learners to be aware of listening problems and to motivate them to be more responsible to deal with the difficulties they have encountered. In a similar vein, the findings of this research emphasizes the raising of awareness on listening strategy use among Turkish young EFL learners, which has a conjunct influence on achievement in listening comprehension. Also, Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) agree that teaching learners a set of strategies contribute them to be strategic listeners as they have high awareness in strategy use. Lastly, Coyle (2007) suggests the findings of this research by highlighting the possibility of building strategic students and strategic classrooms where language teachers are models for strategy use with their explicit and implicit strategy instructions (Oxford, 2001).

The listening strategy instruction examined in this study resulted in the statistically significant difference in listening comprehension performance between the experimental group and control group Turkish EFL primary school level students. The listening strategy instruction grounded in the curriculum in EFL context promotes learners' performance and/ or achievement in listening comprehension. Similarly, the findings of the different studies (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010; Simasangyaporn, 2016), questioning the outcomes of listening strategy training on listening achievement have supported the results of this study. The findings of Simasangyaporn's research (2016) indicated that the greater application of the strategies taught in the intervention contributed to the higher levels of comprehension recorded for the intervention group. The improvement in listening comprehension of the intervention group was significantly greater than that of the comparison group among 150 Thai students in three months. Due to the large number of students in each classroom, approximately 35-40 students, and the limitations in the use of scaffolding, it has reflected that there is a possibility of listening strategy instruction in real classroom settings in different context cultures where there are a large number of students. Moreover, Graham and Macaro's study (2008) provided empirical evidence that strategy instruction can have a positive impact on second language learners' listening comprehension. Woore (2007) conducted a research project on L2 phonics instruction in an English secondary school. A class of

German learners received an explicit phonics instruction and they worked out the pronunciation of new words to decode L2 sounds by using poems. Then, it was seen that learners taking explicit instruction improved in the accuracy of their word pronunciation more than learners not taking the same instruction. Similarly, in this research, there seems that the experimental group students started to work out words' meaning and to decode sounds which were similar in their native language.

In another research conducted by Woore (2014) to the beginner level learners of French across four different schools, five classes received explicit instruction in problematic French symbol-sound system compared to English. Again the students in the experimental group made more progress in the pronunciation of unfamiliar French words compared to the members of parallel classes who did not receive the instruction. Hulstijn (2003) suggests learners a huge amount of practice in order to develop automaticity by using familiar and simple texts in the target L2 listening. Macaro et al. (2015) has identified a number of studies on problems in segmenting speech stream in listening, and argued on difficulties in developing sound system mappings. To help learners to deal with segmenting speech stream, some studies evaluated the explicit instruction of phonics.

Furthermore, Vandergrift (2003) investigated the use of listening strategies used by 36 English-speaking learners of French who are divided as less and more skilled listeners. It was found that more skilled listeners adopted a dynamic approach to listening with the use of top-down processing compared to the less skilled listeners who are relying on the bottom-up strategies. It seems that it is necessary to provide enough instruction on listening strategy and approaches for information processing to demonstrate how practical it is to combine strategy use when they need it. On the other hand; Macaro et al. (2015) regard that it is listeners' ability to orchestrate their strategic behaviour as a result of strategy intervention. In other words, strategy training can be integrated to the curriculum but the students' responses to that instruction will be in their hands. In a way, they might ignore the training on strategy use and awareness-raising that is presented them.

Perhaps more importantly, one of the aims of strategy training is not only to develop listening performance of the students but also to lead a strategic behaviour by increasing their degree of autonomy. Macaro et al. (2015) point out that the effective strategic behaviour as; "to deploy a range of strategies flexibly and in effective combinations; to monitor their on-going comprehension; and to revise their initial interpretations in the light of subsequent contradictory information" (p.53). Also, Grenfell and Macaro (2007), Macaro and Erler (2008) and Vandergrift and Goh (2012) have noted that students having strategic behaviour can work more effectively as they know how to combine strategies in case of communication breakdowns.

The strategic behaviour, on the other hand, encourages language users to be more responsible in their own learning and let them deploy higher level strategic thinking skills. In a similar vein, Graham and Macaro (2008) notes that the use of some strategies such as inferencing may not be helpful if it is deployed on its own as a

strategy; in fact, it functions when it is kept as a part of a cluster of strategies. However, when listeners use inferencing with their use of background knowledge and experiences to overcome the L2 listening problems as well as the use of bottom-up strategies for word recognition, they can have high performance in their listening comprehension. Thus, the knowledge of metacognitive and cognitive listening strategies and students' willing manner to internalize the presented strategies will let them more control on their own listening process and increase their achievement in foreign language learning.

Furthermore, there are fundamental principles concerning cognition and common implications for foreign language listening comprehension performance. "For processing of information to take place, attention must be directed at the input and some amount of decoding and analysis of the signals must occur. Listeners must perceive and recognize words in a stream of speech and at the same time parse it into meaningful units or chunks" (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012, p.396). The key feature of listening instruction is to help listeners recognize and parse incoming input properly. When visual input such as facial expressions, gestures, illustrations, video clips is presented, the information will have to be processed simultaneously with auditory input as it is related to the content of the message.

As incoming information is being processed, it is acted upon by existing knowledge or schemata retrieved from long-term memory. Prior knowledge facilitates quicker processing (Vandergrigt & Goh, 2012). The ability to process speech successfully depends on how much linguistic information is processed quickly. This is often referred to as automatic processing. In general, skilled FL listeners combine various strategies such as directing their attention, monitoring their interpretation and solving problems in an orchestrated and harmonious manner (Goh, 2000; Vandergrift, 2003). In this research, EFL students in both high and low level in listening could incorporate both metacognitive and cognitive strategies, and showed an achievement in their listening comprehension after the listening strategies implementation. Contrarily, Renandya (2012) argued that listening strategy instruction may not work with lower proficiency level students because of weakness of empirical evidence existing on L2 listening strategies, requirements of the strategy instruction for teachers and learners in the implementation process, and complication of the strategies for lower level students' learning. He claimed that language learners might have many problems with both bottom-up strategies and top-down strategies. However, Cross (2012) countered to Renandya (2012)'s view by highlighting how many studies mentioned the development of listening strategy research in the past twenty years with their empirical results. This research also contributes to the importance of listening strategy instruction for the listeners' achievement in listening comprehension.

In conclusion to the discussion of the findings, an effective listening curriculum recognizes "listening comprehension as an active, strategic and constructive process" (Long & Doughty, 2011, p.402). When students listen to tasks and do listening activities, they may need some help or guidance of their teachers during listening. As

listening is a mental operation, teachers may want not to manipulate their listening process. However, guiding students with the application of listening strategies and incorporating it into the lesson sequence is a pedagogical support (Liu & Goh, 2006; Field, 2008; Field, 2014). This pedagogical cycle develops awareness-raising activities in listening, and teaching of strategies to the students. Students need repeated and systematic listening practices to compensate for the gaps in their listening process (Graham, 2017; Field, 2014). A carefully controlled strategy intervention conducted over a period of time can help young learners to improve their listening comprehension, and strategy use. This research have some limitations. The number of the participants, and not applying a delayed post-test might be limitation of this research. In further studies, researchers might reach larger groups, and compare group differences with richer data.

5. Conclusions

It was concluded that strategy instruction had contributions as it encouraged language learners to be more aware and responsible individuals in foreign language listening process. However, there is still a need for more research in listening strategy intervention to reach more general insight into young learners' listening performance and listening strategy use in EFL context. This study contributed to the field of listening strategy instruction fostering the teachable feature of listening comprehension skill and listening strategies. Thus, the listening skill beside the other skills such as reading, writing, and speaking should be very important part of curriculum designed for the teaching of English as a foreign language. Also, teaching listening and especially listening strategy interventions should be included in the in-service teacher education programmes in EFL context.

Moreover, there are various findings in the literature review on the listening strategy instructions in different culture contexts. Commonly, many of them proved that listening strategy intervention models had provided contributions on the improvement of listening comprehension of the target groups. The significant findings obtained from the previous studies with the implementation of strategy training on listening revealed that strategy training is highly effective for the increase of listening achievement. Therefore, the foreign language teachers should give instructions on the use of listening strategies and they should increase their students' awareness on the employment of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies implicitly. Based on the age factor, the application of awareness-raising activities might increase the students' understanding on the instruction process. Foreign language teachers should reveal their students' existing repertoire of listening strategies and should present them models for the use of listening strategies when they need to deal with their listening comprehension problems. It can be proposed that foreign language teachers pedagogically should train their students to do more strategic listeners who do self-evaluation and self-monitoring in their listening comprehension.

A further crucial pedagogical implication of the study is that foreign language teachers should explore their students' cognitive and metacognitive information processing in listening and should allow them to use strategies related to listening comprehension. Teachers should introduce listening strategies throughout the foreign language learning process and should follow a process based approach rather than production based. Foreign language learners most probably might become more aware on the strategy employment and they may incorporate the listening strategies practiced during the listening instruction process into their repertoire of listening strategies.

Acknowledgements

The Research and Publication Ethics Statement

The Ethics Committee/Board approval for this study was obtained from Hacettepe University Ethics Committee, Ankara/ Turkey on 15/08/2017 by No 35853172/433-2924 ethical considerations were violated in this study.

The Conflict of Interest Statement

In line with the statement of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), we hereby declare that I/we had no conflicting interests regarding any parties of this study.

Notes

1. Listening comprehension in the present study means unidirectional (one-way listening) rather than interactional listening (two-way).
2. The young learners participating to this study has parental support and motivation beside the school managers and teachers' academic support.
3. We are aware of the possible challenges in the classroom setting in the listening strategy intervention because of some factors such as student-to-student interaction, classroom dynamic, age and use of both native and target languages.
4. We are aware that the young learners engaged in the semi-structured interviews verbalised their thoughts as well as they could in trying to answer to each question.

References

Anderson, J. R. (2009). *Cognitive psychology and its implications.* New York: Worth Publishers.

Borhany, M., Tahriri, A., & Tous, M. D. (2015). The impact of explicit/integrated instruction of listening comprehension strategies on EFL learners' L2 listening comprehension and their overall strategy use. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(8), 128-144.

Chamot, A. U. (1995). Learning strategies and listening comprehension. In D. & Rubin, *A Guide for Teaching of Second Language Listening* (pp.13-30). San Diego, California: Dominie Press.

Chen, A. (2009). Listening strategy instruction: Exploring Taiwanese college students' strategy development. *Asian EFL Journal, 11*(2), 54-85.

Chen, A. (2015). The impacts of listening strategy instruction on strategy use and listening performance of EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3*(5), 75-87.

Cohen, A. D. (2003). Strategy training for second language learners. *Digest: EDO-FL*, 03-02. Retrieved from https://www.ericdigests.org/2004-4/language.htm

Cohen, A.D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learning strategies: Thirty years of research and practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corbett, J., & O'Farrell, R. (2013). *English Quest 4.* Macmillan Education.

Coyle, D. (2007). Strategic classrooms: Learning communities which nurture the development of learner strategies. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(1), 65-79.

Cross, J. (2012). Listening strategy instruction (or extensive listening): A response to Renandya (2012). Retrieved from http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/files/2013/12/Listening-strategy-instruction-or-extensive-listening_editforpdf-15mvwem.pdf

De Silva, R., & Graham, S. (2015). The effects of strategy instruction on writing strategy use for students of different proficiency levels. *System, 53*, 47-59.

Dreyer, C., & Nel, C. (2003). Teaching reading strategies and reading comprehension within a technology-enhanced learning environment. *System*, *31*(3), 349-365.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Field, J. (2014). Cognitive processing and foreign language use. In Driscoll, P., Macaro, E., and Swarbrick, A. (Eds.), *Debates in modern languages education* (pp.14-29). London: Routledge.

Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (2005). *Second language listening: Theory and practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Geranpayeh, A., & Taylor, L. (2013). *Examining listening: Research and practice in assessing second language listening* (Studies in Language Testing Vol. 35). Cambridge University Press.

Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System, 28*(1), 55-75.

Goh, C. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. *System, 30*, 185-206.

Goh, C., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal*, *60*(3), 222-232.

Graham, S. (2011). Self-efficacy and academic listening. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(2), 113-117.

Graham, S. (2017). Supervising on how to design model for strategy intervention into the classroom environment. University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom.

Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy instruction in listening for lower-intermediate learners of French. Language Learning, *58*, 747-783.

Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2013). Selective listening in L2 learners of French. *Language Awareness, 22*(1), 56-75.

Graham, S., Santos, D., & Francis-Brophy, E. (2014). Teacher beliefs about listening in a foreign language. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 40*, 44-60.

Graham, S., Santos, D., & Vanderplank, R. (2010). Strategy clusters and sources of knowledge in French L2 listening comprehension. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 4*, 1-20.

Grenfell, M., & Macaro, E. (2007). Language learner strategies: Claims and critiques. In Cohen, A.D. and Macaro, E. (Eds.), *Language learners' strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (pp.9-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2003). Connectionist models of language processing and the training of listening skills with the aid of multimedia software. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 16*(5), 413-425.

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. London: George Allan & Unwin.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*(1), 159-174.

Liao, C. Y., & Yeldham, M. (2015). Taiwanese high school EFL teachers' perceptions of listening instruction. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*(2), 92-101.

Lincoln, S. Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liu, J., & Goh, C. (2006). Improving second language listening: Awareness and involvement. In Farrell, T.S.C. (Ed.), *Language teacher research in Asia* (pp.91-106). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Long, M. H., & Doughty, C. J. (2011). *The handbook of language teaching.* Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(3), 320-337.

Macaro, E., & Erler, L. (2008). Raising the achievement of young-beginner readers of French through strategy instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(1), 90-119.

Macaro, E., Graham, S., & Woore, R. (2015). Improving Foreign Language Teaching: Towards a research-based curriculum and pedagogy. London: Routledge.

Mareschal, C. (2007). Student perceptions of a self-regulatory approach to second language listening comprehension development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Morse, J. M., & Niehaus, L. (2009). *Mixed methods design: Principles and procedures*. Walnut Creek; CA: Left Coast Press.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(1), 76-91.

Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning strategies. In R.Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Teaching English to speakers of other languages,* (pp.166-172). Cambridge University Press.

Plonsky, L. (2011). The effectiveness of second language strategy instruction: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 61*(4), 993-1038.

Renandya, W. A. (2012). Five reasons why listening strategy instruction might not work with lower proficiency learners. Retrieved from http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/files/2014/06/Five-Reasons-Why-Listening-Strategy-Instruction-Might-Not-Work-With-Lower-Proficiency-Learners_editforpdf-o13kt9.pdf

Rost, M. (2011). *Teaching and researching listening*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Santos, D., Graham, S., & Vanderplank, R. (2008). Second language listening strategy research: Methodological challenges and perspectives. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, *21*(2), 111-133.

Simasangyaporn, N. (2016). The effects of listening strategy instruction on Thai learners' self-efficacy, English listening comprehension and reported use of listening strategies (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Reading. Reading, the UK.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, *53*(3), 463-496.

Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching, 40*, 191-210.

Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00559

Yeldham, M., & Gruba, P. (2014). Toward an instructional approach to developing interactive second language listening. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(1), 33-53.

Wilson, J. J. (2010). *How to teach listening*. England: Pearson Longman.

Woore, R. (2007). Using poems and learner strategies to help learners decode the sounds of the L2. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(2), 175-188.

Woore, R. (2014). Developing reading and decoding in the MFL classroom. In Driscoll, P., Macaro, E. and Swarbrick, A. (Eds.), *Debates in modern languages education* (pp.81-95). London: Routledge.