European Journal of English Language Teaching
ISSN: 2501-7136
ISSN-L: 2501-7136
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejel.v6i6.3955 Volume 6 | Issue 6 | 2021

VIETNAMESE ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' USE OF LISTENING STRATEGIES

Vo Hoang Duy[1i],
Nguyen Hai Quan[2]
[1]Gia Viet English Language School, Vietnam
[2]Can Tho University, Vietnam

Abstract:
The crucial role of listening skill in language learning has been well acknowledged, yet attention to this skill remains modest. Numerous studies investigating learners' listening performance have identified listening strategies as a key factor contributing to the success of effective listeners. This study, using a Likert-scale questionnaire, examined the listening strategies employed by 81 Vietnamese English-majored students, who were divided into two groups - effective and less effective listeners based on an IELTS proficiency test. Findings showed that listening strategies were used at a relatively high level with the metacognitive group employed most frequently compared to cognitive and socio-affective strategies. Lowering anxiety, predicting and planning, resourcing, repetition, and cooperation were found most commonly employed individual strategies. Although no significant differences were found between the groups' use of the three overarching strategy categories, several discrepancies were identified concerning their use of individual strategies, which provides important implications for listening pedagogical adjustments in this particular context.

Keywords: listening strategies, Vietnamese tertiary context, cognitive, metacognitive and socio-affective strategies

1. Introduction

Among the four macro-language skills, listening plays a significantly special role both as a means for input in language acquisition and as a target skill that learners need to master. Rost (1994) contends that listening comprehension is crucial to the development of learners' language knowledge since it provides input and enables learners to interact in spoken communication. Wilson (2008) also acknowledges listening as the key to knowing a language. Along with these roles, listening features itself as a sophisticated skill that is

[i] Correspondence: email justduy52@gmail.com

highly challenging for learners to master. In fact, it is the one skill that "makes the biggest processing demands" since "*learners must store information in short-term memory while striving to interpret the material*" (Rubin, 1995, p. 8). In academic context, listening is viewed as the most basic skill (Nunan, 1998), which is "*critical to academic success at every level of education*" (Vandergrift & Goh, 2018, p.123).

Despite these well-established essential roles, listening has generally been considered as a 'Cinderella' among the four skills in both areas of language pedagogy and research (Buck, 2001; Flowerdew & Miller, 2005; Nunan, 2002). As a result of this insufficient attention to the skill, it is "*probably the least understood, the least researched and historically the least valued*" (Wilson, 2008, p. 17). More substantial attention to this particular skill, however, has been evident in the past decade, leading to a larger volume of literature and a better understanding of the skill. On the one hand, theoretical developments have shed more critical light on the complicated cognitive process going on in the listeners' mind during the listening undertaking and the challenges they encounter in the process. On the other hand, different aspects of listening pedagogy have been investigated through a collection of textbooks, devoted to the teaching of the listening skill (e.g., Brown, 2006; Flowerdew & Miller, 2005; Rost, 1994; Vandergrift & Goh, 2018, Wilson, 2008).

In general, previously conducted studies place a strong focus on either teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching listening skill (e.g., Goh, 2008, 2010; Graham, 2006; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Graham, Santos & Vanderplank, 2011; Siegel, 2013; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010) or learners' development of listening ability and problems in the listening process (Graham, 2006, Graham, Santos & Vanderplank, 2011; Vandergrift, 2002, 2003). Together, this research body has reaffirmed the complexity of the listening process and the teachability of this particular skill in classroom context. A large number of specialists have also pointed out that one important aspect that deserves due attention in listening instruction is the learners' use of listening strategies. Abundant research evidence has proven that there is a positive correlation between listening strategy use and listening comprehension ability (Bidabadi and Yamat, 2011; Goh, 2008; Oxford, 1990; Vandergrift, 2003; Vandergrift & Goh, 2018). These studies also identified listening strategies as one of the typical attributes of effective listeners that distinguish them from less competent ones. As such, the question of how to effectively facilitate learners' development of listening strategies could be seen as a fruitful avenue that might contribute significantly to learners' listening development.

In the Vietnamese context, although numerous innovations have been undertaken to address the quality of language teaching and learning, which promotes a stronger focus on the four macro-language skills, listening skill, however, remains an area of under-researched across different school levels. Several studies conducted in relation to this skill seem to draw attention to learners' problems in listening and their use of strategies in testing conditions (e.g., Duong & Chau, 2019; Ngo, 2016; Nguyen & Thai, 2018). As such, the current understanding of the issue of whether and how Vietnamese learners actually make use of the strategies for better listening effectiveness is still limited. Given that listening strategies have a critical role to play in learners' success in listening

performance, obtaining a comprehensive picture of the existing situation concerning students' use of these strategies in listening seems to be mandated as a foundation for further attempts to better facilitate the development of learners' listening ability. Gaining an in-depth understanding of learners' use of listening strategies in Vietnamese context is what the current study was designed for.

2. Literature review

2.1. Language learning strategies

An important construct that is directly relevant to and serves as the foundation of listening strategies is learning strategies. Learning strategies, at the outset, was broadly stated as the techniques or devices that learners utilize to take in knowledge (Rubin, 1975). Weinstein and Mayer (1986) define learning strategies as "*behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning that is intended to influence the learner's encoding process*" (as cited in Ellis, 1994, p.290). Oxford (1990) sees these as the specific actions taken by language learners to adjust their own learning towards a more contented, effortless, untroublesome, self-identical, effective, and applicable. As O'Malley and Chamot (1990) put it, these strategies involve "*special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information*" (p. 1). In the same vein, Wenden (1987) sees these strategies are techniques or devices that involve a certain combination of procedures or paces, ideas or plans, and habits to benefit the process of acquiring, remembering, and applying information. Although these definitions vary, to some extent, concerning the terms employed, they generally view learning strategies as any thoughts, behaviours, devices, techniques or procedures that learners make use of to support them in language analysis and processing for understanding, learning and retaining information.

Numerous models of learning strategies exist in the literature. However, the two proposed by O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) and Oxford (1990) are generally seen as both most comprehensive and fine-grained. In particular, Oxford (1990) groups all strategies in two major types: direct and indirect. Direct strategies are defined as those that require metal processing of the language and consist of three groups of strategies comprising memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. Indirect strategies refer to those that facilitate and control the language learning process without directly entailing the target language. These include metacognitive, affective, and social strategies; and these groups of indirect strategies are believed to be handy and fitting to the four macro skills in language (listening, speaking, reading, writing) in almost all language learning contexts. Oxford's classification of language learning strategies has been viewed as the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies (Ellis, 1994) as it not only stands on the basis of a synthesis of former work on good language learning strategies but also presents learning strategies in a more systematic and interrelated manner compared to previous models.

Tapping on rather similar categories of strategies, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) outline three types of strategies involving metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social/affective strategies. Accordingly, metacognitive strategies are concerned with planning for learning, monitoring the learning task, and evaluating the learning achievement. Cognitive strategies are seen as the direct interaction with the individual learning tasks, mental and physical manipulation and transformation of the learning materials. Social/affective strategies involve the impact of social and affective processes on learning, which centered communicating and cooperating with others to or employing affective management to facilitate and support a learning task or the learning process (O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper, & Russo, 1985). This classification framework not only retains a systematic nature of the learning strategies but further specifies individual strategies entailed in each category.

Given the comprehensive and systematic manner in the way the two above models present learning strategies, it is also worth noting that there appears to be much similarity and consistency in the details incorporated in the two models. For instance, both frameworks identify metacognitive and cognitive groups as core elements of learning strategies. Also, although the social strategies and affective strategies are presented as distinct categories in Oxford's model, these refer to similar individual groups of strategies housed under the category of social/ affective in O'Malley and Chamot's model. Finally, the memory and compensation strategies in Oxford's categorization are also featured as subsets of the cognitive group in O'Malley and Chamot's model. Together, these frameworks provide a solid foundation for specifications of strategies employed in specific areas or subjects of learning such as listening. They also provide a systematic lens for the investigation of learning strategies in general or listening strategies that the current study aims to explore.

2.2. Listening strategies

Listening strategies are defined as behaviours and thoughts that are committed by a listener during the process in order to decode the spoken massage (Weisntein & Mayer, 1986). Based on Oxford's (1990) concept of learning strategies, listening strategies can be defined as the specific actions taken by language learners to adjust their own listening learning process towards a more contented, effortless, untroublesome, self-identical, effective and applicable. Such actions that learners are committed to are believed to enhance their self-confidence and facilitate the learning process and improve listening performance. In a nutshell, however, these listening strategies refer to the actions or techniques that are activated by listeners to understand or to learn new information from the utterances (Teng, 1997).

As earlier mentioned, the two models of learning strategies developed by O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) and Oxford (1990) provide an overarching frame for specifications of strategies learners use in specific areas of study. Concerning the listening skill, Vandergrift (1996, 1997) and Flowerdew and Miller (2005) suggest a model of three major listening categories of metacognitive, cognitive and socio-affective strategies, each encompassing specific individual strategies and explanations encompassed.

Accordingly, *metacognitive strategies* are defined as mental activities for directing and regulating language learning (Vandergrift, 1997), a constitution of 4 individual strategies namely planning, monitoring, evaluation and problem identification. S for explanations, *planning* is seen as listeners' effort to build up an awareness of undertaking required steps to accomplish a listening task or developing a proper action plan and/or appropriate contingency plans to overcome difficulties possibly interfering the successful completion of the task. *Monitoring* is concerned with checking, verifying, modifying comprehension or performance during a course of a listening task. *Evaluation* is defined as checking the outcomes of student's listening comprehension or strategies used in reflection to internal measures of completeness and accuracy. *Problem identification* indicates the learners' ability to clearly identify the crucial challenges or problems to be solved in a task or identifying an aspect of the task that hamper its successful completion.

Cognitive strategies, the second category, are defined as the mental process undertaken by students to reach a task completion (Vandergrift, 1997). They involve mental and physical interaction and manipulation between learners and the material in accompany with implementing particular strategies in a learning task (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Adapted from the learning strategies taxonomy developed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Vandergrift (1997) presents an assortment of 11 individual strategies incorporated in the group of cognitive strategies, including: inferencing, elaboration, summarization, translation, transfer, repetition, resourcing grouping, note-taking, deduction/induction, substitution.

Finally, *socio-affective strategies* cover activities involving interacting with others or undertaking affective control to benefit a learning task (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). They are concerned with two main aspects including learners' interaction with other speakers and their attitudes regarding learning (Wilson, 2008). In this sense, this strategy group is derived from the two facets including socio and affective strategies. The former consists of cooperation and questioning for clarification while the latter comprises lowering anxiety, self-encouragement and taking emotional temperature. Their conceptualisations of these three overarching listening strategy groups together with the constituents each of them encompasses, as presented above, are employed as a backbone framework for the exploration of learners' use of listening strategies in the current study.

2.3. A review of previous studies

A large volume of research has been conducted focusing on the critical aspect of learners' use of listening strategies, which inform the kinds of strategies listeners in different contexts usually employ. For instance, Namaziandost, Neisi, Mahdavirad, and Nasri (2019) in a study investigating listening comprehension problems and strategies used among Iranian advance EFL learners pointed out metacognitive strategies as chief listening strategy used by the learners. In a different study conducted by Jia and Wang (2017), it was found that first-year vocational college non-English majors from three departments of Chengdu Textile College employed a medium degree of listening strategies, and cognitive strategies were used the most often, followed by metacognitive strategies, and social-affective strategies.

In Vietnamese context, H. T. H. Le (2011) conducted a study of 82 learners at a high school in the Mekong Delta, seeking to examine the listening strategy groups and the individual listening strategies used by subject along with the correlation between the extent of use of listening strategies and English listening ability, and the discrepancy towards how effective and less effective listeners employed listening strategies. Quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire revealed that the participants were aware of listening strategies at the average level with the most favor in employing translating repeating while taking notes appeared to be the least frequently use strategies. It also pointed out a positive correlation between high school students' listening ability and their use of listening strategies. Particularly focusing on metacognitive strategies use by English non majored students with in the TOEIC listening, using mixed-method, Tran (2012) found that the participants' use of metacognitive strategies was at high level with the most frequently employing of planning. Additionally, no apparent quantitative relationship between the students' use of metacognitive strategies and their listening comprehension achievement; yet, it qualitatively suggested some differences in students' use of metacognitive strategies corresponding to their listening comprehension achievement.

A number of studies have also reported on specific or individual strategies employed by effective and less effective listeners. For instance, Chamot and Kupper (1989) used a think-aloud procedure to explore the differences in listening strategies between effective and less effective high school learners. They found that effective students at the intermediate level made greater use of strategies such as selective attention, self-evaluation, note-taking, and elaboration (use of world knowledge). In a more recent study focusing on university students of an English Language teaching department, Kök (2017) explored the relationship between students' listening comprehension strategy use and their listening comprehension proficiency. The findings revealed a positive correlation between the two variables; additionally, a statistically significant divergence was found in the practicing of different strategy groups namely metacognitive strategy use was more in favor by the more effective listeners. This finding added more empirical evidence into Vandergrift's (1997) exploration. In detail, towards French context, Vandergrift (1997) conducted a study investigating the comprehension strategies of high school second language listeners (French), which used the think-aloud procedure adapted from O'Malley et al. (1989) and Rankin (1988). The results indicated that more and less proficient listeners applied different patterns of strategy use, and both highly relied on cognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies, especially comprehension monitoring and problem identification were more greatly employed by more-proficient listeners, which differentiated the two surveyed groups.

3. Methods

The present study was designed with a two-fold purpose. First, it explored learners' use of the three groups cognitive, metacognitive and sociocultural listening strategies. Second, it investigated whether there were significant differences between the effective

listeners and less effective ones in relation to their use of listening strategies. In accordance with these aims, the study employed a quantitative method with a questionnaire delivered to 81 university English-majored students. All students were in their junior year and were attending an Advanced Listening and Speaking Course as part of their university program. These students belonged to two cohorts of English Studies and English Interpretation and Translation. At the beginning of the study, an IELTS Listening test was administered to all students and the results were used for dividing the students into two groups of effective and less effective ones. For reliability, this result was also triangulated with the results of the two progress tests and one midterm test administered by the instructor of these classes as part of their evaluation tasks. Accordingly, 24 were placed in the effective listener group with the average score for the IELTS test at 5.5 minimum while the other 57 students belonged to the group of less effective.

Data for the study were collected via a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire the include 55 question items. Among these, 51 items were designed based on the Listening Strategies Classification models proposed by Flowerdew and Miller (2005) and Vandergrift (1997) (both of these were developed on the basis of Oxford's, 1990; and Chamot & O'Malley's and, 1990). Certain modifications were made to make the items more appropriate to the context of the study. In addition, Vandergrift et al's (2006) Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was also referred to for the adaptation of several items in the questionnaire. Finally, the 4 remaining items added to the questionnaire were designed based on Wilson's (2008) suggestions of listening strategies listeners could employ as part of the post-listening stage. These include item 52 (organising ideas and language learnt from the task for further learning); item 53 (reconstruct listening content orally or in writing); item 54 – identifying problem area; and item 55 – using scripts as a tool for solving language/ listening problems and confirming information.

With respect to organisation, the 55 items in the questionnaire were divided into three clusters including (1) cognitive strategies, (2) meta-cognitive strategies and socio-affective strategies. Each of these overarching categories, in turn, encompasses different groups of sub-strategies and individual strategies. As can be seen in Table 1, the cognitive group includes 22 items, which are further divided into two sub-groups of *Inferencing* (including 5 types: linguistic, voice, paralinguistic, extralinguistic inferencing and inferencing between parts) and Elaboration (including 5 individual strategies of personal, world, questioning and creative elaboration and imagery). This group also entails seven individual strategies of summarization, translation, transfer, repetition, resourcing, grouping and note-taking. The second major category, meta-cognitive houses under itself 26 question items divided into three sub-groups: planning (including advanced organization, directed attention, selective attention and self-management); monitoring (including comprehension, auditory and double-check monitoring) and evaluation (including performance and strategy evaluation). The third category, socio-affective strategies, included 7 items that refer to five individual strategies of questioning for clarification, cooperation, lowering anxiety, self-encouragement and taking emotional

temperature. Specific question items with reference to each specific strategy, sub-groups and major categories included in the complete questionnaire are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Listening strategies clusters and questionnaire items

Strategies	Sub-groups	Specific Strategies	Items
Cognitive Strategies	Inferencing	Linguistic inferencing	1,13
		Voice inferencing	14
		Paralinguistic inferencing	15
		Extralinguistic inferencing	16
		Inferencing between parts	2,17
	Elaboration	Personal elaboration	18
		World elaboration	3
		Questioning elaboration	19
		Creative elaboration	20
		Imagery	4,21
	Summarization		40
	Translation		22
	Transfer		23
	Repetition		24
	Resourcing		41,55
	Grouping		25,26
	Note taking		27
Metacognitive	Planning	Advanced organization	5,6,7,8,9,52,53
		Directed attention	28,29,30
		Selective attention	31
		Self-management	10,32,33
	Monitoring	Comprehension monitoring	34,35,36
		Auditory monitoring	37
		Double-check monitoring	38
	Evaluation	Performance evaluation	42,43,44,45
		Strategy evaluation	46
	Problem Identification		47, 54
Socio-Affective	Questioning For Clarification		11,48
	Cooperation		49,50
	Lowering Anxiety		39
	Self-Encouragement		12
	Taking Emotional Temperature		51

The questionnaire was designed in bilingual (Vietnamese and English) in the form of a five-point Likert scale with options ranging from (1) – never, (2) – seldom, (3) – sometimes, (4) – usually, (5) – always to explore the frequency of students' use of listening strategies. As the main aim of the study was to explore the participants' use of listening strategies in relation to each specific stage of their listening implementation process of before, while and after listening, the items in the questionnaire were sequenced in accordance with these three stages for convenient processing of the data. Number of specific items that belong to each of the three stages are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: The number of items per each listening stage

Stages	Items	Total
Before listening	1 – 12	12 items
While listening	13 – 39	26 items
After listening	40 – 55	15 items

Before being officially administered, the questionnaire was piloted to 24 participants. The data collected from piloted questionnaire was inputted into SPSS version 20 for running scale test. The reliability result was 0.915 Cronbach's Alpha which indicated that the Listening Strategies Questionnaire that would be using in the study is highly reliable. For analysis of the official data collected from the 81 questionnaires, SPSS version 26 was employed as the main platform for undertaking the statistical procedure. In terms of process, the *Descriptive Statistic* was run to get the *mean scores*, *maximum scores*, and *minimum* scores of each cluster. Then, *One Sample T-Test* was run to examine whether the means were statistically different from the known values in the three-point scale of means for showing the degree of listening strategies use: above or equal to 3.5 – *high use*, 2.5 to 3.4 – *medium use*, lower than 2,5 – *low use*. Afterward, *Independent Sample T-Test* was run to examine the differences between the two groups of listeners regarding the use of listening strategies.

4. Results

4.1 Students' overall listening strategies use

To examine the learners' general use of listening strategies, the Descriptive statistic test was run, and the result is present in Table 3. In addition, to examine whether the mean of participants' use of listening strategies was significantly different from the test value *3.0* which showed the average frequency use of listening strategies according to Oxford (1996), a *One Sample T-Test* was run with the results presented in Table 4. As can be seen in the tables, the sample mean (*M = 3.52, SD = 0.38)* was notably distinctive from the test value *3.0*, (*t = 12.2, df = 80, p = 0.00*), which indicated that the English-majored university students used listening strategies in implementing listening tasks at a relatively high level.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics test: Overall listening strategies use

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Listening Strategies	81	2.73	4.33	3.52	.386

Table 4: One Sample Test: Comparing the sample mean and the test value 3.0

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Listening Strategies	12.218	80	.000	.52525	.4397	.6108

4.2. Students' use of specific groups of listening strategies

Along with identifying the overall listening strategies use of the participants, the study further investigated learners' frequency in using each specific strategy groups of *cognitive*, *metacognitive* and *socio-affective*. A *Descriptive Statistics Test* was used to determine the mean scores of each cluster of listening strategies. As can be seen in Table 5 below, among the three categories, *metacognitive group* was ranked most frequently used (M=3.66), followed by *socio-affective strategy* (*M = 3.47*), and *cognitive* (*M = 3.37*). The result from the *One-Sample T-test* also revealed that there was no remarkable variance between *socio-affective strategy group* (*t = -0.735, df = 80, p = 0.465*) and the overall mean while *cognitive strategy group* (*t = -3.009, df = 80, p = 0.004*) and *metacognitive strategy group* (*t = 3.1, df = 80, p = 0.003*) showed the major dissimilarity compared to the total mean value of the listening strategies. This indicated that in general the participants used *socio-affective strategies* to the extent that was similar to the overall use of listening strategies in implementing listening tasks, which was at high-use level. In relation to the other two clusters, the degree of using *cognitive strategies* among the participants was lower than the overall listening use (*MD = -0.14626*) while, in contrast, *metacognitive strategy group* showed a considerable higher use than the total as well as other listening strategy groups (*MD = 0.14762*).

Table 4: Descriptive statistics test: The use of three listening strategy groups

	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cognitive Strategies	2.50	4.23	3.37	.437
Metacognitive Strategies	2.62	4.69	3.66	.428
Socio-affective Strategies	2.14	4.71	3.47	.579

4.2.1 Students' use of metacognitive strategies

As reported above, metacognitive strategies were found to be the most highly frequently used among the three major groups of listening strategies. A further investigation into students' use of each sub-group in this category showed that *predicting and planning*, as can be seen in Table 6, topped at *M = 3.77*, followed by *monitoring* with *M = 3.66. Evaluation* and *problem identification* were lowest ranked among the four with their mean at 3.54 and 3.27, respectively.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics test: The use of four individual metacognitive strategies

	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Predicting and Planning	2.79	4.71	3.77	.431
Monitoring	2.60	5.00	3.66	.574
Evaluation	1.20	5.00	3.54	.709
Problem Identification	1.00	5.00	3.27	.873

Findings also showed that *predicting and planning* was remarkably practiced by listeners in all the three stages of the listening process. As evident in the mean score of items *5, 6, 7, 8, 9* (*M = 3.50*), in the *before-listening stage*, the subjects generally operated *advanced organization* presenting via a variety of actions: reading carefully the input, thinking about

similar text to draw predictions, clarifying the goal of the tasks and opting for suitable strategies parallel with getting in the frame of mind for the upcoming listening tasks. In the *while-listening stage*, as evident in the results of items 28 to 33 (M= 3.98), the participants executed several steps and adjustments to manage their attention expressing through that they primarily focused on main points, key words and ignored irrelevant distractors along with immediately and harder re-concentrating to the text as disruption occurred. In association with items *52, 53* (*M = 3.50*), *after listening*, the listeners also organized new ideas and language learnt from the task and pondered contriving for further effective practice or other skills' learning.

Monitoring was also found highly employed by the listeners (*M = 3.77*) but merely at *while-listening stage* when they frequently checked, verified and adjusted their comprehension with the text's situation, general knowledge, and personal knowledge of sounds in target language. Besides, they additionally monitored their performance fairly often via double-checking across the tasks, or in the second time listening to the oral text, if any. *Evaluation* and *problem identification,* however, were exclusively used at *post-listening stage*. Concerning *evaluation* (*M = 3.54*), after finishing listening, the listeners often assessed their performance by thinking back to how they processed the listening task, evaluating their level of understanding as well as mirroring their strength or success. As to *problem identification* (*M = 3.27*), it witnessed a medium use by listeners at *post-listening stage* when they reflected problems or obstacles encountered during listening were undertaken by the subjects. In a like manner, the participants analyzed in detail the reasons or factors leading to wrong interpretation or misunderstanding the texts quite sometimes after finishing the listening tasks.

4.2.2. Students' use of cognitive strategies

With respect to specific cognitive listening strategies, it should be reminded that in total 9 individual strategies constitute this group including *inferencing, elaboration, summarization, translation, transfer, repetition, resourcing, grouping,* and *note taking*. Among these individual strategies, it was found that the two specific strategies of *resourcing* (*M = 3.77*) and *repetition* (*M = 3.76*) were employed at the highest level. In association with items 41 and 55 in the questionnaire, *resourcing* reflected that listeners accessed to available reference sources of information about the target language (e.g. dictionary or tape scripts) at *post-listening stage* while at *while-listening stage*; listeners were more frequent to sound out or repeat chunks of language to familiarize with their sounds (*repetition – item 24*). Following these two strategies, *translation* (*M = 3.17*) and *note taking* (*M = 3.12*) were relatively used by the listeners at medium level. During *while-listening stage*, the subjects moderately decoded what they were hearing into Vietnamese; likewise, they sometimes utilized abbreviated verbal, graphic or numerical form for writing down what they caught. Overall, it can be summarized that, four out of nine *individual cognitive strategies* were used at a high level while as a whole the *cognitive strategy group* was just at medium use level.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics test: The use of individual cognitive strategies

	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inferencing	2.29	5.00	3.33	.573
Elaboration	2.17	5.00	3.47	.543
Summarization	1.00	5.00	3.35	.912
Translation	1.00	5.00	3.17	1.232
Transfer	1.00	5.00	2.96	1.054
Repetition	1.00	5.00	3.76	1.075
Resourcing	1.50	5.00	3.77	.746
Grouping	1.00	5.00	3.04	.898
Notetaking	1.00	5.00	3.12	1.122

With regards to the three individual cognitive strategies namely *elaboration* (*M = 3.47*) *summarization* (*M = 3.35*) and *inferencing* (*M = 3.33*), it was witnessed that there was a relatively closeness towards their mean scores and the test value 3.5 of high frequency usage level. The two remaining strategies, *transfer* and *grouping,* were found to be least utilized by the students with its mean scores at 2.96 and 3.05, respectively. This suggests that the subjects appeared less favored to relating what they heard to their knowledge of Vietnamese to address the meaning as well as linking the heard sounds to the words sounded the same, or breaking up words for parts towards the sounds they might recognize at *while-listening stage*.

4.2.3 Students' use of socio-affective skills

Among the five individual strategies encompassed in the socio-affective categories, the analysis results indicated that *lowering anxiety* ranked the first place with *M = 4.42*. Following this was *cooperation* with *M = 3.72* and *taking emotional temperature* with *M = 3.60*. At the fourth place was *questioning* with *M = 3.08,* and *self-encouragement* placed at the lowest position with *M = 2.7*.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics test: The use of five individual socio-affective strategies

	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Questioning for Clarification	1	4.5	3.07	0.851
Cooperation	1	5	3.72	0.935
Lowering Anxiety	1	5	4.42	0.772
Taking Emotional Temperature	1	5	2.70	1.289
Self-Encouragement	1	5	3.60	1.137

Due to the observable divergence among the mean scores of five *individual socio-affective strategies*, it was rational to opt the overall mean score of this strategy group as a central figure for comparing and contrasting. Hence, a *One Sample T-Test* was run to test if there were radical differences among the mean scores of individual *socio-affective strategies* and the overall mean of the strategy group. Results from the test showed that except *taking emotional temperature* (*t = 1.068, df = 80, p = 0.289*) which was not considerably different from the overall mean score of *socio-affective strategy group*, the other four *individual socio-affective strategies* showed notable divergences. In particular, *lowering anxiety* (*M = 4.42*, *t*

= 11.06, df = 80, p = 0.00, MD = 0.95), was the most frequently used individual socio-affective strategies among the listeners. It was almost always employed by the subjects at *while-listening stage* on which they took mental steps or techniques to stay calm and less anxious.

Another high plied individual strategy was *cooperation (M = 3.72*) which included asking classmates or other listeners to clarify, check, compare comprehension. Besides, the listeners also perceived *taking emotional temperature* (*M = 3.60*) as an effective strategy for improving their English listening comprehension proficiency when they often think of it as a challenging skill sometimes causing frustration. The other two *individual socio-affective strategies* including *questioning for clarification* and *self-encouragement* were relatively highly practiced by the subjects at medium level with the mean scores at 3.08 and 2.70, respectively. Regarding *questioning for clarification*, the listeners sometimes asked their peers or teachers to clarify tasks' goal before listening or explanation at post stage while at *pre-listening stage*, they were less favored to encourage themselves by positive self-talk which was seen as *self-encouragement*.

4.3 Differences between effective and less effective listeners concerning their use of listening strategies

As presented earlier, the second major aim of the research was to investigate whether there existed any significant differences between the two groups of effective (24 students) and less effective students (57 students) with respect to their use of listening strategies. Accordingly, the means scores of the two groups were calculated and compared. As shown in Table 8, both group of listeners use listening strategies at high level with the mean score of the effective group at 3.57 and the less effective one at 3.51. Also, for both groups, *metacognitive strategies* were found to be the most frequently used ($M_1 = 3.79$, $M_2 = 3.62$). In general, there appeared to be no meaningful distinction between the two groups of listeners in the use of listening strategies (*t = 0.623, df = 79, p = 0.535*). It also indicated that there were no marked distinctions between the two groups of subjects towards the mean scores of three listening strategy sets including *cognitive strategy* (*t = -0.235, df = 79, p = 0.815*), *metacognitive strategy* (*t = 1.6, df = 79, p = 0.1*), and *socio-affective strategy group* (*t = -0.682, df = 79, p = 0.497*). In this sense, it is suggested that in general both groups of listeners employed listening strategies at relatively comparable levels or frequency.

Table 8: Mean scores of frequencies in the use of listening strategy groups

Listening Strategy	Effective Listeners (N=24)		Less Effective Listeners (N=57)		t	Sig.
	M_1	SD_2	M_1	SD_2		
Cognitive	3.36	0.48	3.38	0.42	-0.235	0.815
Metacognitive	3.79	0.43	3.62	0.42	1.665	0.100
Socio-affective	3.40	0.56	3.50	0.59	-0.682	0.497
Total	3.57	0.42	3.51	0.38	0.623	0.535

With regard to the group of *metacognitive* strategies, a comparative analysis of the use of individual strategies by the two groups showed that there was no statistically substantial gap between the two groups except for *problem identification* (t = 4.49, p= *0.000*). In particular, more able listeners were found to employ problem identification at high level (M = *3.88*) while it was just at medium degree of frequency to less able listeners (M = *3.02*) (See Table 9). Specifically, it was distinctive at the post-listening stage when proficient listeners worked carefully and more frequently towards the difficulties that they had encountered as well as analyzed in details the reasons preventing them from understanding while less proficient listeners just sometimes undertook these actions.

Table 9: Mean scores of frequencies in the use of individual metacognitive strategies

Listening Strategy	Effective Listeners (N=23)		Less Effective Listeners (N=57)		t	Sig.
	M_1	SD_1	M_2	SD_2		
Planning	3.88	0.44	3.73	0.43	1.42	0.159
Monitoring	3.73	0.54	3.63	0.59	0.66	0.508
Evaluation	3.58	0.87	3.53	0.64	0.24	0.811
Problem Identification	3.88	0.70	3.02	0.82	4.49	0.000
Total	3.79	0.43	3.62	0.42	1.66	0.100

There also appeared to be no marked difference between proficient listeners and less proficient listeners with regard to using *cognitive* strategies (t = *-0.23, p= 0.815*). However, a closer examination of their use of individual listening strategies revealed certain important distinction between the two groups. In particular, these significant differences were found with the two individual cognitive strategies namely *translation* (t = *-4.144*, p= *0.000*) and *transfer* (t = *-3.196, p= 0.002*). It indicated that during *while-listening stage*, less able listeners appeared more favorable to *translating* and *transferring* what they were hearing into Vietnamese to address the meaning with (M_2 = *3,51*, SD_2=*1.07*) and (M_2 = *3,19*, SD_2=*0.93*) respectively, which was less preferred by more able listeners when they exclusively employed *translation* (M_1 = *2,38*, SD_1 =*1.24*) and *transfer* (M_1 = *2,42*, SD_1 =*1.14*) at medium level. Additionally, there were differences observed from the mean scores of the individual cognitive strategies. As shown in Table 11 , *elaboration*, *repetition* and *grouping* were apparently more preferable to more able listeners while, seemingly, less able listeners relied on *translation*, *transfer* and *resourcing* to a greater extent when conducting listening tasks.

Table 10: Mean scores of frequencies in the use of individual cognitive strategies

Cognitive Strategy	Effective Listeners (N=24)		Less Effective Listeners (N=57)		t	Sig.
	M_1	SD_1	M_2	SD_2		
Inferencing	3.33	0.60	3.34	0.57	-0.096	0.924
Elaboration	3.60	0.55	3.42	0.54	1.316	0.192
Summarization	3.54	0.88	3.28	0.92	1.178	0.242
Translation	2.38	1.24	3.51	1.07	-4.144	0.000
Transfer	2.42	1.14	3.19	0.93	-3.196	0.002

Repetition	3.92	1.06	3.70	1.09	0.819	0.415
Resourcing	3.58	0.86	3.85	0.69	-1.485	0.142
Grouping	3.23	0.88	2.96	0.90	1.212	0.229
Notetaking	3.08	1.21	3.14	1.09	-0.208	0.836
Total	3.36	0.48	3.38	0.42	-0.235	0.815

Similarly, no significant differences were found in the two groups' use of socio-affective strategies as a whole ($t = -0.682$, $p = 0.497$). In general, both groups employed *socio-affective strategies* rather often when exercising listening tasks; however, from a detailed scope, it could be seen that *taking emotional temperature* significantly characterized listeners use of individual socio-affective strategies regarding their proficiency ($t = -3.039$, $p = 0.003$). The proficient listeners' group showed a lower degree of using *taking emotional temperature* ($M1 = 3.04$, $SD1 = 1.33$) in comparison to the other group ($M_2 = 3.84$, $SD_2 = 0.96$). Specifically, after finishing the listening tasks, more able listener was sometimes getting in touch with negative emotion caused by English listening while the others were quite frequently aware of that feeling and had to deal with that.

Table 11: Mean scores of frequencies in the use of individual socio-affective strategies

Cognitive Strategy	**Effective Listeners (N=23)**		**Less Effective Listeners (N=57)**		**t**	**Sig.**
	M_1	**SD_1**	**M_2**	**SD_2**		
Questioning for Clarification	3.13	0.82	3.04	0.87	0.390	0.698
Cooperation	3.77	0.94	3.70	0.94	0.302	0.764
Lowering Anxiety	4.63	0.58	4.33	0.83	1.566	0.121
Self-encouragement	2.38	1.35	2.84	1.25	-1.501	0.137
Taking Emotional Temperature	3.04	1.33	3.84	0.96	-3.039	0.003
Total	3.40	0.56	3.50	0.59	-0.682	0.497

5. Discussion and Recommendations

The first major goal of the study was to investigate learners' use of listening strategies when conducting listening tasks. Findings from the study revealed that in general learners employed listening strategies at a relatively high level when conducting listening tasks with the mean value of 3.52. In total, it was found that 18 individual strategies that belong to all three categories of *cognitive, metacognitive* and *socio-affective* were employed by the students. It was also revealed that the participants employed listening strategies in all three stages of the listening, namely, before-, while-, and after-listening. This finding indicated the fact that the students were relatively strategic in listening with quite a good level of variety in the strategies they employed.

This finding, in general, appears to show a lack of convergence with results from previous studies including Jia and Wang's (2017) in China and Le's (2011) in Vietnamese context. Both of these studies reported students' average level of students' awareness and perception of using listening strategies and a relatively low of strategy use. This discrepancy, however, could be explained on the basis that Le's study was conducted in a Vietnamese high school context where a strong focus on listening skill might be still

absent; thus, students might have not been introduced and guided with a variety of listening strategies to employ. The participants in the present study, however, were university English-majored senior students who have undertaken listening courses for six semesters continuously in the program. As such, they should have been equipped themselves with a wide range of listening strategies. In this sense, the inconsistency between the current study and Le's (2011) and Jia and Wang's (2017) seems to hint on Rubin's (1975) suggestion that the employment of listening strategies depends on a number of variables comprising target language proficiency, age, situation, and cultural differences. In other words, it seemingly suggests that the participants were strategic listeners when they were highly aware of and actively executed strategies to benefit listening tasks' accomplishment.

Another notable finding from the study was that among the three strategy groups, *metacognitive strategies* were found to be employed the most, followed by *socio-affective strategies* and *cognitive strategies*. The students' dominating use of meta-cognitive strategies indicated that this student cohort was highly strategic towards planning, monitoring, evaluating, and identifying their problems in their listening. When predominantly employing metacognitive strategies, the students highly pondered about their listening process, which includes organizing, planning for listening within and beyond the tasks, monitoring of comprehension or the outcomes when the listening task is being undertaken and finally self-evaluating after finishing. On the other hand, their less common use of *cognitive strategies* might indicate that the participants had limited mental and physical interaction and manipulation with the material in the listening tasks. Similarly, the students also showed a lesser amount of interaction with others or using affective control to assist their listening tasks, which directed the smaller use of socio-affective strategies compared to metacognitive. As suggested by O'Malley and Chamot (1990), socio-affective strategies describe the techniques listeners use to cooperate with one another, to solve their listening problems, to verify understanding or to lower anxiety.

The fact that students made use of *metacognitive strategies* more than the *cognitive* and *socio-affective* groups has been reported by a number of different previous studies both in Vietnamese and other contexts. For instance, Tran's (2012) in Vietnamese context, Namaziandost et al.'s (2019) study with Iranian advanced learners and Lin and Gan's (2014) research of Taiwanese English-majored college students all reported on the highly common use of metacognitive strategies compared to the other two groups. To a certain extent, these studies collectively suggest that university students, regardless of majored or non-majored groups, have a tendency to rely more on metacognitive strategies to approach their listening tasks in practice. This finding incorporates with Goh's findings (1997) regarding strategic knowledge in the study examining metacognitive awareness of second language listeners, which pointed out the extensive awareness of listening strategies demonstrated by students for assisting comprehension together with developing listening.

It should be noted, however, that this finding also shows contrast with results reported from a couple of previous studies conducted in Vietnamese context. For instance, Duong, Tran and Tran's (2018) study towards the Vietnamese high school students' use of listening strategies reported that cognitive strategies were more highly used while the metacognitive group was just moderately employed. Nguyen's (2020) research with 150 university EFL freshmen also found that cognitive strategies were the most commonly used group compared to the metacognitive and socio-affective ones. These contrast findings could be interpreted on a number of bases. First, numerous researchers and specialists (e.g., Green & Oxford, 1995; O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper & Russo, 1985; Vandergrift, 2003; and Wharton, 2000) suggest that metacognitive strategies appeared to be more frequently employed by high-proficiency learners, rather than low-proficiency one. Vandergrift and Goh (2018) also contend that "*skilled listeners appear to use about as twice as many metacognitive strategies as their less skilled counterparts*" (p. 137). They further maintain that in order for this group of strategies to be employed effectively, these strategies need to be introduced to students and opportunities for students to learn, practice and frequently monitor and evaluate their use of these strategies are of critical importance. On these bases, the fact that the students in the current study were found to make use of the metacognitive strategies more frequently could have its relevance to the students' senior level and might have resulted from the learning and practice opportunities they had been provided throughout the program they attended at the university. In this sense, to further facilitate the students' use of these strategies as well as their effectiveness in supporting students in listening performance, these metacognitive strategies need to be officially and systematically included in the listening courses offered to the students.

With respect to the learners' use of individual strategies, it was found that lowering anxiety – a subset of socio-affective strategy was found to be the highest used among all individual strategies. This suggests that the students almost always execute mental steps to lessen nervousness and escalate the feeling of being competent to better perform the listening tasks. A number of previously conducted studies have justified for the value of lowering anxiety strategies employed by the learners. For instance, Hamzah, Shamshiri and Noordin (2009) suggested that relaxation techniques were possible to generate an atmosphere with friendliness, support and relaxation, which encourages risk taking and results in alleviating foreign language anxiety and facilitating learning. Ngo (2015) also argued that greater use of *lowering anxiety strategies* among the subjects in her present study was possibly due to difficulties in understanding the spoken input, or other listening problems such as those suggested by Graham (2006) including fast speech and limited vocabulary knowledge.

Closely followed lowering anxiety strategy, *predicting and planning* was found to be the second most commonly employed individual strategy. This implies that the students are highly strategic in preparing for completing the tasks, targeting the particular area of input to focus and maintaining attention while listening to process the listening tasks successfully. This finding is, to some extent, consistent with the results reported by Bidabadi and Yamat's (2010) study indicating that EFL students mostly used

planning. It evidently supports that planning has a significant impact on overall listening as it does not hamper the listening (Goh, 2002). In the current study, planning was also found to be used to refer to actions beyond the listening tasks' boundaries including organizing and storing new ideas and language for further language learning. In this sense, it revealed that the students frequently gathered vocabulary or structures learnt from the text, then arranged and sought for the opportunities to implement in the future listening learning or across the skill.

The next two strategies found to be closely comparable to planning were *resourcing* and *repetition*. Given that *resourcing* was used the most frequently, it is suggested that students tended to work on other material of the target language, which is outside the texts to aid their comprehension. Towards repetition as the favorable individual cognitive strategy, it concurred with Le's (2011) findings reporting repetition as a frequently employed strategy. It can be reasoned that repeating the heard words is an essential step adding student evoke their knowledge of vocabulary to facilitate comprehension achieve. Justifying from a different angle, it might be the residual influence in students' behavior after being instructed with Audio-lingual method, which centers forming habits from dialogue and pattern drills repeated by learners (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This finding, however, is different from that reported by Ngo's (2015) study with students in Vietnamese context in which translation, elaboration and inferencing were found to be most preferred strategies. One reason for this difference could be the participants proficiency levels, which is quite upper-intermediate and advanced for students in the current study while it was intermediate level in Ngo's study. It can be reasoned that more proficient listeners are able to undertake more input from the listening; hence they can apply their world knowledge to approach comprehension. This, in turns, reflects upon a suggestion made by Graham et al., (2010) that linguistic knowledge is crucial as it facilitates non-linguistic knowledge activation.

The remaining two strategies commonly employed were *taking emotional temperature* and *cooperation*. Accordingly, taking motional temperature, which could be described as listeners' developing an awareness of negative emotions brought by listening to stay positive and motivated, was expressed at high level. The fact that the participants have been undertaking countless of listening tasks and gained experienced thoroughly formed such this consciousness. With respect to cooperation, which expresses listeners' mutual aid, appeared to be more favorable in comparison to other socio-affective strategies. In this sense, the students were more willing to collaborate with friends to work on the angles of the listening including clarifying comprehension and tasks' goal, modelling, and proving feedback. It might be drawn from the students' perception of the closeness between them and their mates versus their teachers. Specifically, with their friends, the students might be more open and direct to share while they are supposed to maintain visible and invisible space to their teachers, which respects hierarchical relationship in Vietnamese culture. This finding is concurrent to Ngo's (2015) when she found that the students mainly asked questions to their friends, not their teachers.

With regard to the second focus of the study – investigating the differences between strategies use conducted by effective and less effective listeners, in general there seemed to be no significant differences found. Both groups were found to have employed strategies at high level of frequency. This finding runs parallel to results reported by DeFilippis (1980) indicating that skillful and unskillful listeners were reported to be nearly equal in the use of listening strategies. It also echoes Watthajarukiat's (2012) finding that no meaningful differences existed in either individual strategy use or strategy category use between more and less able Thai university students. To a certain extent, the fact that no significant differences were found between the proficient and less proficient listeners seemingly signal that strategy use might not be the most decisive factors in students' listening performance. Such an argument has been made by a number of experts and researchers. Apart from listening strategy use, listener characteristics are also characterized with several other angles, namely, general language proficiency (Zuo, 2013), vocabulary knowledge (Bonk, 2000; Staehr, 2009; Vandergrift & Baker, 2015), metacognitive awareness (Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari, 2006; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010; X. Zuo, 2013), and working memory and processing speed (Andringa et al., 2012). In essence, the participants' listening ability was not solely dependent on the use of listening strategies which might explain for the lack of differences between effective and less-effective groups.

With respect to the three listening strategy groups including *cognitive*, *metacognitive* and *socio-affective*, no notable divergences were identified between more and less able listeners' groups. Both groups were found to consistently employ metacognitive strategies at highly frequently level. *Cognitive strategies* were also comparably used by the two groups which was similar to *socio-affective* strategies. This is, to some extent, inconsistent to Kok's (2017) finding indicating statistically significant difference between the students' listening comprehension achievements in favor of the group with high metacognitive and cognitive strategy use, which was previously stated by Vandergrift (2003) and Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010).

Several points worth noting concerning the differences between the two groups' use of individual strategies. First, for the *metacognitive* category, it was statistically suggested that more effective listeners frequently employed problem identification strategy; that is, identifying problem areas or obstacles preventing them from comprehend the text compared to the less effective counterparts. This finding is paralleled to Vandergrift's (1997) and Kök's (2017) idea, correspondingly revealing that more able listeners employed a greater extent of problem identification. There is empirical evidence that good listeners are more strategic and determined to identify the specific problem area (Wilson, 2008). Concerning the *cognitive* group, more able listener tended to employ more on *repetition* and *elaboration* and less relied on *transfer*, which is viewed as using knowledge from mother tongue to facilitate target language listening. This finding incorporates with Vandergrift's (1997) stating that less successful listeners report using this strategy almost twice as much as their more successful ones. It also revealed that students with more listening ability employed a considerable smaller amount of *translation*, which showed rendering ideas from one language to another in a

relatively compared to the less able group. This finding evidently supports findings from several previous studies including DeFilippis's (1980), Vandergrift's (1997, 2003), Naoko's (2000), Goh and Hu's (2014), Kök's (2017). Finally, for the *socio-affective* category, the two groups were significantly divergent in the use of *taking emotional temperature*, defined as understanding and sensing emotional states from the listening to alert negatives and benefit from the positives (Vandergrift, 1997). It can be reasoned that more able listeners were less struggled with negative emotions when dealing with listening comprehension as their ability accompanied with experience undertaking listening tasks somehow set a concrete mental state for them. In contrast, less able listeners might realize their listening proficiency as their shortcoming, which leads to the lack of confidence along with the emerging of harmful sensations, especially when achieving comprehension was failed.

6. Conclusion

This study modestly contributes to the current understanding of an under-researched topic - learners' use of listening strategies in the Vietnamese tertiary context. Findings from the study brought into light the fact that Vietnamese English-majored learners employed listening strategies at a relatively high frequency. Metacognitive strategies were found to be most commonly and frequently used compared to the cognitive and socio-affective groups. It also informed that predicting, planning, monitoring, resourcing, repetition, lowering anxiety and cooperation topped the list of individual strategies that the students relied on in listening task implementation. With reference to the differences in strategy use between the two groups of effective and less effective listeners, although no significant discrepancies were found in relation to their general use of the three overarching strategy groups, evidence suggested that more proficient listeners seemed to make use more of problem identification, elaboration, grouping and lowering anxiety. Less proficient listeners, however, had a tendency to resort more to translation, transfer, resourcing and taking emotional temperature beside lowering anxiety. These findings provide important implications for both learners and teachers in reference to the identification of what listening strategies should be further incorporated and promoted in the training programs for these English-majored groups of learners.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

About the Authors

Vo Hoang Duy has been teaching English at language centers since he completed a Bachelor's degree of English Education in 2018. Currently, he is pursuing MA program at Can Tho University. He draws attention to research in the domain of Listening and Speaking pedagogy.

Dr. Nguyen Hai Quan has been working as a lecturer in Can Tho University since 2001. He holds a Doctoral Degree from the University of Wollongong, Australia and a Master

Degree from the University of Antwerp, Belgium. His research interests include Listening and Speaking pedagogy, teacher professional development, learners' outcomes and career development, and intercultural communication.

References

Andringa, S., Olsthoorn, N., van Beuningen, C., Schoonen, R., & Hulstijn, J. (2012). Determinants of success in native and non–native listening comprehension: An individual differences approach. *Language Learning*, *62*, 49–78. doi:10.1111/j.1467–9922.2012.00706.x

Bidabadi, F. S., & Yamat, H. (2010). The relationship between listening strategies employed by Iranian EFL freshman university students and their learning style preferences. *European Journal of Social Science, 16(3), 342–351*.

Bonk, W. (2000). Second language lexical knowledge and listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening*, *14*, 14–31. doi:10.1080/10904018.2000.10499033

Brown, S. (2006). *Teaching Listening*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chamot, A. U., and L. Kupper (1989). "Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction." *Foreign Language Annals 22*(1), 13–24.

DeFilippis, D. A. (1980). A study of the listening strategies used by skillful and unskillful college French students in aural comprehension tasks. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 2481A.

Duong, T. M., Tran, T. T. H., & Tran, T. Q. (2019). Eleventh graders' actual use of English listening learning strategies at Duong Van Duong high school. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, *35*(1), 114–130.

Duong, T. M., & Chau, N. T. (2019). English listening comprehension problems perceived by English majors at The Saigon International University. In T. T. Dang (Eds.), Proceedings of International Conference on Language Teaching and Learning Today 2019: Autonomy and Motivation for Language Learning in the Interconnected World (pp. 209–222), Ho Chi Minh City: Vietnam National University–Ho Chi Minh City Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Flowerdew, J. H., & Miller, L. (2005). *Second Language Listening: Theory and Practice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners. *ELT Journal*, *(51)4*, 361–369.

Goh, C. (2002). Learners' self–reports on comprehension and learning strategies for listening. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *12*, 45–68.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC, 39*(2), 188–213.

Graham, S. (2006). Listening comprehension: The learners' perspective. System, 34(2), doi:165–182. 10.1016/j.system.2005.11.001

Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy instruction in listening for lower–intermediate learners of French. *Language Learning*, *58*(4), 747–783.

Graham, S., Santos, D., & Vanderplank, R. (2010). Strategy clusters and sources of knowledge in French L2 listening comprehension. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*(1), 1–20. doi:10.1080/17501220802385866

Graham, S., Santos, D., & Vanderplank, R. (2011). Exploring the relationship between listening development and strategy use. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(4), 435–456.

Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(2), 261–297.

Hamzah, M. S. G., Shamshiri, K., & Noordin, N. (2009). Effects of socio–affective strategy training on listening comprehension. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *11*(4), 690–697.

Hsiao, T. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(3), 368–383. doi:10.1111/1540–4781.00155.

Jia, Li–ping, & Wang, Zhao–hui (2017a). A study of English listening strategies of vocational college non–English majors in China. *US–China Foreign Language*, *15*(3), 161–172. doi:10. 17265/1539–8080/2017.03.003

Kök, İ. (2017). Relationship between listening comprehension strategy use and listening comprehension proficiency. *International Journal of Listening*, *32*(3), 163–179. doi:10.1080/10904018.2016.1276457

Le, H. T. H. (2011). *An investigation into listening strategies of EFL students within the high school setting* (Unpublished Master thesis). Cantho University, Cantho, Vietnam.

Lin, C., & Gan, X. (2014). Taiwanese College Students ' Use of English Listening Strategies and Self-Regulated Learning. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 2*(5), 67-65.

Namaziandost, E., Neisi, L., Mahdavirad, F., & Nasri, M. (2019). The relationship between listening comprehension problems and strategy usage among advance EFL learners. *Cogent Psychology*, *6*(1), 1691338. doi:10.1080/23311908.2019.1691338

Naoko, O. (2000). Listening strategy instruction for female EFL college students in Japan. *DAI-A 60(12), 43–52.*

Ngo N. H. T. (2015). Some insights into listening strategies of learners of English as a foreign language in Vietnam. *Language, Culture and Curriculum. 28*(3), 311–326.

Nguyen, Q. N., & Thai, D. C. (2018). Listening comprehension: First–year English–major students' perceptions and problems. *Can Tho University Journal of Science, 54*(2), 75–83.

Nguyen, H. D. N. (2020). Understanding EFL students' use of listening strategies in watching English captioned movies. *Vietnam Journal of Education*, *4*(2), 37–46.

Nunan, D. (1998). *Approaches to teaching listening in language classroom*. In proceedings of the 1997 Korean TESOL Conference. Taejon, Korea: KOTESOL.

Nunan, D. (2002). Listening in Language Learning. *Methodology in Language Teaching*, 238–241. doi:10.1017/cbo9780511667190.032

OMalley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner–Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., and Kupper, L. (1985). Learning strategies applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 557–84

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Rankin, J. M. (1988). Designing thinking–aloud studies in ESL reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *4*(2), 119–132.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (Cambridge Language Teaching Library)* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Rost, M. (1994). *Introducing listening*. London: Penguin.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language learner can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly*, *9*, 41–51. doi:10.2307/3586011

Siegel, J. (2013). Second language learners' perceptions of listening strategy instruction. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, *7*(1), 1–18. doi:10.1080/17501229.2011.653110

Staehr, L. S. (2009). Vocabulary knowledge and advanced listening comprehension in English as a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *31(4)*, 577–607.

Teng, H. C. (1997). An investigation of EFL listening strategies by Taiwan college students. Paper from the proceedings of the sixth international symposium on English teaching (pp.509–519). Taipei: Crane.

Tran, M. T. N (2012). *An investigation into metacognitive listening strategies used by English non majored students within the setting of TOEIC listening* (Unpublished Master thesis). Cantho University, Cantho, Vietnam.

Vandergrift, L., & Baker, S. (2015). Learner variables in second language listening comprehension: An exploratory path analysis. *Language Learning*, *65*, 390–416. 10.1111/lang.12105

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference; An empirical study. *Language Learning*, *60*(2).

Vandergrift, L. (1996). Listening Strategies of Core French High School Students. *Canadian Modem Language Review 52*(2), 200–223.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(3), 387–409. doi:10.1111/j.1944–9720.1997.tb02362.x

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, *53*(3), 463–496. doi:10.1111/1467–9922.00232

Vandergrift, L., God, C., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, A. H. (2006). Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning*, *56*(3), 431–462.

Watthajarukiat, T., Chatupote, M., & Sukseemuang, P. (2012). An Investigation of English listening strategies used by Thai undergraduate students in public universities in the South. *Journal of Liberal Arts Prince of Songkla University*, *4*(2).

Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R.E. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed. pp. 315–327). New York: Macmillan.

Wenden, A. L. (1987). *Incorporating learner training in the classroom*. In A. Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds), 159–167.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language learning*, *50*(2), 203–243.

Wilson, J. J. (2008). How to Teach Listening (1). New York: Pearson Education.

Zuo, J. (2013). An empirical study on the effect of schemata and language proficiency on EFL listening comprehension. *Overseas English,* 102– 103.

Zuo, X. (2013). The relevant research on English listening comprehension strategies and listening levels. *Disciplines Exploration*, 50–51.

Appendix: Listening Strategy Questionnaire (English version)

Before listening,…

1. I use all my background knowledge to guess the meaning of new words in the listening tasks and predict the answers.
2. I read all provided information and questions and try to find out the connection among ideas in the text.
3. I use the topic to determine key ideas that I will listen for.
4. I picture some key words in my mind.
5. I always read carefully all the provided input (e.g., situation, speakers, questions) to understand as much as I can about what I am going to listen.
6. I think about similar texts that I have listened to before to make predictions about the content and language in the listening tasks.
7. I make sure I know clearly what I have to do for the tasks.
8. I make sure I clearly understand the goals of the tasks.
9. I try to understand the tasks and think about what strategies I need to employ to listen effectively.
10. I try to get in the frame of mind to understand English.
11. I make sure to ask (teachers, friends) for clarification about the goals of the tasks.
12. I encourage myself through positive self-talk.

When listening,…

13. I use my knowledge of familiar words to approach the meaning of unknown words that I hear.
14. I use speaker's tone of voice as clues to understand the meaning of the text.
15. I use speaker's facial expressions and gestures (watching tasks) to help me understand the meaning.
16. I pay attention to features such as background noise and situations as clues to help me understand the meaning.
17. I try to listen for transitional words/ cohesive devices as clues to help me understand the structure of the text and meaning.
18. I use my experience and knowledge about the topic to approach the meaning.
19. I compare what I hear to the world knowledge to logically address the meaning.
20. I try to adapt what I hear to make the story more interesting to me.
21. I use mental or actual pictures to help me comprehend the texts.
22. I translate what I can hear into Vietnamese in my head.
23. I relate what I hear with my knowledge of Vietnamese to address the meaning.
24. I sound out the words to familiarize with their sounds.
25. I try to relate the sounds I hear to the words that sound the same.
26. I break up words for parts towards the sounds I might recognize.
27. I write down what I hear in abbreviated verbal, graphic, or numerical form.
28. I mainly focus on the key points and ignore irrelevant distractors.
29. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.

30. I try to quickly get back on track if I lose concentration.
31. I focus on listening to the key words.
32. I put everything aside to concentrate on what is saying.
33. I ask myself what I am listening to or what I have understood.
34. When I think I understand something, I check if it fits in with the situation.
35. When I think I understand something, I compare it with my general knowledge.
36. I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realise that it is not correct.
37. I use the sound of words to relate to other words I know.
38. When I realize I misunderstand a point, I go back and check.
39. I try not to be anxious and keep calm.

After listening,…

40. I remember the key points and then logically summarize them in my mind to address the meaning.
41. I look up words that I did not understand so that I can learn them.
42. I think back to how I listened and think about what I might do differently next time.
43. I regularly ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.
44. I evaluate how much I've understood every time I finish a task.
45. I reflect on my strength or my success in the listening.
46. I evaluate my strategy use and think of other strategies that I should use for the next time I listen to the same kind of text.
47. I reflect on my problems or difficulties that I encounter during the listening process.
48. I ask the speaker/teacher to repeat or explain.
49. I ask my classmates to clarify my comprehension.
50. I compare and check my comprehension with other listeners.
51. I understand that listening in English is challenging, which sometimes causes my frustration.
52. I try to organize new ideas and language I have learned from the task for further learning.
53. I try to see how I can apply what I have learned from the listening task in speaking or writing.
54. I analyze specific reasons or factors that prevent me from understanding the texts correctly or lead me to misunderstanding.
55. I read the tape-scripts carefully to make sure I understand thoroughly the content and meaning of the tasks and texts.