

Speaking Metacognitive Strategies in Classroom Practice: Senior High School Students' Experiences

Alfiah Zahro

2210631060058@student.unsika.ac.id

Fikri Asih Wigati

fikri.asihwigati@staff.unsika.ac.id

Mobit

mobit@fkip.unsika.ac.id

Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the stages of metacognitive strategies most frequently used by high school students in learning English speaking skills, as well as the factors that influence their use. This study employs a qualitative case study design supported by descriptive quantitative data. This study used a 1–5-point Likert scale questionnaire adapted from SILL and SCICASA to provide an initial descriptive overview, while in-depth interviews with 15 selected students served as the primary data. The findings indicate that all metacognitive stages are frequently used. The evaluation stage was the most dominant ($M = 3.81$), driven by students' learning awareness and feedback from teachers. This stage was closely followed by the planning stage ($M = 3.79$), which was influenced by students' desire to prepare materials and their motivation to achieve good grades. The monitoring stage was the least frequently used ($M = 3.65$) due to anxiety about real-time communication and fear of pronunciation errors. As a practical implication for spoken language teachers, integrating structured metacognitive support into classroom instruction, such as providing pre-speaking planning activities, guided reflection sheets, and targeted positive feedback, can effectively help students manage anxiety and improve their speaking skills.

Keywords: EFL Speaking; Evaluation; Metacognitive Strategies; Planning

INTRODUCTION

Learning English at school does not only focus on cognitive aspects such as memorizing vocabulary and understanding grammar. It also includes other skills, especially speaking. Speaking is an essential productive skill because it allows students to express ideas, interact with others, and take part actively in communicative situations. However, speaking is one of the most challenging skills in EFL learning because it requires the ability to communicate effectively in direct conversation (John et al., 2021). This is because students need to face several challenges, such as vocabulary knowledge, correct grammar, pronunciation, limited vocabulary, and fluency (Kulsum et al., 2025). Some factors contribute to students'

speaking difficulties. Students often face problems such as anxiety, low motivation, low confidence, and shyness (Kulsum et al., 2025). These factors can reduce communication fluency and make students reluctant to participate in speaking activities. By understanding these challenges, teachers can help students improve their speaking skills through supportive teaching approaches that provide a safe environment and many opportunities to practice.

Addressing these challenges is through the use of language learning strategies, which help learners manage the process of acquiring a language rather than focusing solely on outcomes. Oxford (1990) categorizes language learning strategies into six types: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social. Among these six strategies, the metacognitive strategy can be used to help students learn to speak English (Alfarisy, 2022). In the context of speaking skills, metacognitive strategies are essential. The ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate their learning contributes to the improvement of students' speaking skills. The planning stages give students clear goals and a structured research schedule, which not only reduces anxiety but also fosters a sense of accomplishment and progress (Lai et al., 2025). In addition, during the monitoring stage, students begin to recognize errors or difficulties in oral communication and can use this awareness to adjust or correct their language use (Oxford, 1990). After completing a speaking activity, students can evaluate their performance to identify their strengths and weaknesses in speaking English, and students can compare their current speaking performance with their previous performance, enabling them to improve their speaking skills in future opportunities, and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies used after the learning process is complete. (Fitrianingsih et al., 2025; Lai et al., 2025).

Several previous studies have shown that metacognitive strategies can improve students' speaking skills (Alfarisy, 2022). Previous studies have examined the use of metacognitive strategies at the university level to investigate their impact on students' speaking skills (Dangin & Hartati, 2022). Previous research has also examined the use of metacognitive strategies among university students and shown that students employ the stages of metacognitive strategies to varying degrees (Fitrianingsih et al., 2025). However, there are differences in how students use metacognitive strategies, stemming from differences in the frequency with which they employ the stages of metacognitive strategies in speaking learning. For example, some students prefer to use the planning stages rather than monitoring or evaluating stages (Imran et al., 2026). These differences are due to various factors, such as students' learning awareness, the influence of teacher feedback, learning motivation, and the development of self-confidence (Alfarisy, 2022; Fitrianingsih et al., 2025; Lai et al., 2025; Maharani et al., 2024). However, there remains a gap between previous research and the current research.

The previous studies have not thoroughly examined how these strategies are applied in the context of high schools in Karawang. This is important because understanding how students apply metacognitive strategies in speaking exercises to

help students identify the dominant stage and the factors that determine which learning practices are suitable for students, such as structured feedback or guided reflection activities to support the development of students' speaking skills more effectively.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous Research

Researchers have identified several previous studies showing that metacognitive strategies play a crucial role in speaking learning. Previous research conducted by Alfariy (2022) examined the speaking learning strategies of EFL students at a Yogyakarta state university using the Oxford Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and found that metacognitive strategies are frequently used by students, with learners demonstrating high awareness of planning and self-monitoring during language learning. While the previous research focused on general language learning strategies, the current research specifically examines the stages of metacognitive strategies, planning, monitoring, and evaluating, used by Karawang, Indonesian senior high school students during classroom speaking activities.

The research by Dayag-Tungpalan (2023) aimed to identify the metacognitive strategies used by ESL learners in speaking activities and to analyze the relationship between speaking performance and the factors that influence it. The results showed that planning was the most frequently used strategy, followed by evaluating and monitoring. In addition, the research found that factors such as communication anxiety, vocabulary proficiency, grammar, topic knowledge, exposure to English, and preparation time were significantly associated with speaking performance. However, the previous research focused more on the relationship between metacognitive strategies and speaking performance, while the current research examines the specific factors that influence the use of each stage of metacognitive strategies.

Dangin and Hartati (2022) examined college students' metacognitive strategy awareness and its relationship with speaking ability. In contrast, the current research was to investigate the stages of metacognitive strategies predominantly used by high school students and the factors influencing students' strategy use rather than merely examining their correlation with speaking achievement. Maharani et al. (2024) examined the language learning strategies used by successful participants in a Korean speech contest and found that metacognitive strategies were the most prevalent among all language learning strategies. In contrast, the current research focuses on high school students' English speaking skills based on their experiences during speaking learning in the classroom, thereby providing insights into the use of metacognitive strategies in the context of learning.

Lai et al. (2025) investigated the relationship between metacognitive strategies and enjoyment in foreign language learning through qualitative research. Their findings indicate that planning, monitoring, and evaluation enhance learners' self-confidence, motivation, and enjoyment in language learning. Unlike previous studies that emphasized emotional engagement and enjoyment in learning, the current research focuses on how these factors influence their application during speaking practice.

Fitrianingsih et al. (2025) identified the metacognitive strategies used by university students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in speaking instruction and reported that planning, monitoring, information management, error correction, and evaluation were frequently used, although evaluation tended to be used less consistently. In contrast to their research, which examined university students and a broader range of metacognitive components, the current research focuses specifically on planning, monitoring, and evaluation among high school students and combines questionnaire findings with interview data to explain the factors influencing students.

Imran et al. (2026) examined the use of metacognitive strategies among non-language majors and found that planning received the highest average score, followed by monitoring and evaluation, while qualitative findings indicated that reflection and self-evaluation were not consistently practiced. Although both studies examined the stages of metacognitive strategies, this research differs in that it focuses on high school students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes and investigates the contextual factors that shape students' use of planning, monitoring, and evaluation stages.

In general, previous studies have consistently shown that metacognitive strategies play an important role in improving speaking skills, learning awareness, self-regulation, and language learning outcomes. However, most of the existing research to date has focused on college students, language learning strategies in general, or the relationship between metacognitive strategies and speaking performance. Only a few studies have specifically investigated which metacognitive stages are most dominant during classroom speaking instruction at the high school level and simultaneously explored the factors that influence students' use of these strategies. Therefore, this research addresses this gap by identifying the dominant stages of metacognitive strategies namely, planning, monitoring, and evaluation, used by Indonesian high school students in classroom speaking activities, as well as by examining the factors that influence their strategic behavior through a mixed-methods approach.

Metacognitive Strategies in Speaking Learning

Speaking skills are the ability to use spoken language to share ideas, feelings, or information with others (Brown, 2001, as cited in Sari et al., 2021). When speaking, students choose words and construct appropriate sentence structures, articulate

sounds clearly in order to convey meaning effectively in communication (Burns, 2019). This demonstrates that speaking skills encompass the ability to communicate confidently with others (Silaban et al., 2025). Speaking skills require students' active engagement in the learning process as well as the use of appropriate learning strategies (Oxford, 1990). Without the right strategies, students may experience difficulties when speaking, such as planning what to say, monitoring errors while speaking, and evaluating their performance after speaking (Oxford, 1990). Therefore, the use of language learning strategies that support awareness, such as metacognitive strategies, can support the development of speaking skills (Zeng & Goh, 2018; Zhang & Qin, 2020, as cited in Fitriainingsih et al., 2025). Among various language learning strategies, metacognitive strategies are considered particularly important because they help students consciously regulate and manage their speaking learning process, thus enabling them to improve their speaking skills more effectively. Metacognitive strategies involve students' ability to monitor and regulate cognitive processes throughout the learning process (Papaleontiou-Louca, 2003, as cited in Luviana et al., 2022). Metacognition is a strategy that enables students to reflect on how they plan, monitor, and evaluate to achieve learning objectives (Dayag-Tungpalan, 2023). According to Oxford (1990), metacognitive strategies consist of several stages, namely: monitoring, planning, and evaluating.

In speaking skills, metacognitive strategies can help students consciously and systematically manage and focus their speaking learning process (Oxford, 1990). Through this strategy, students not only focus on the final speaking performance but also on the process they experience before, during, and after the speaking activity (Fitriainingsih et al., 2025). At the planning stage, students set their speaking learning goals, prepare the topics to be presented, and choose the strategies they consider most effective to improve their speaking performance (Oxford, 1990). The planning stage involves setting clear goals and finding opportunities to practice on your own to improve your speaking skills (Maharani et al., 2024). In the next stage, the monitoring stage, students are required to continuously monitor the accuracy of their pronunciation while they are speaking (Dangin & Hartati, 2022). At this stage, students can make immediate adjustments when they notice mistakes or difficulties in oral communication (Oxford, 1990). After the speaking learning activities are completed, students enter the Evaluation stage, which assesses the extent to which their speaking learning objectives have been achieved (Oxford, 1990). The Evaluation stage helps students identify their strengths and weaknesses in speaking, allowing them to plan more effective strategies for future speaking practice (Lai et al., 2025). Therefore, students who can effectively use metacognitive strategies will find them helpful when speaking during English language learning activities. This is because metacognitive strategies help students understand the material and presentations more clearly, become more organized, and feel more confident when speaking in English (John et al., 2021). Therefore, metacognitive strategies serve as a support for the gradual and reflective development of students' speaking skills.

METHOD

Design and Samples

This research employs a qualitative case study design, supported by descriptive quantitative data. The qualitative approach was chosen because the primary objective of this research is to gain an in-depth understanding of how high school students experience and apply metacognitive strategies during speaking learning activities. A questionnaire adapted from SILL (Oxford, 1990) and SCICASA (Zhang et al., 2021). This questionnaire was used because it has been employed in several previous studies and also provides insight into the extent to which students use each stage of metacognitive strategies (planning, monitoring, and evaluation). This quantitative data served only as a description, identifying which stages were most dominant. The primary data used to answer the research questions, particularly regarding the factors influencing students' use of each stage, were obtained through in-depth interviews, which form the core of this research's findings. A total of 126 eleventh grade students from high schools in Karawang completed the questionnaire. From each class, three students were purposively selected based on their English speaking proficiency, as assessed by their English teachers, resulting in a total of 15 interview participants representing high, medium, and low proficiency levels. This selection procedure was designed to capture diverse perspectives on how students with different proficiency levels experience and apply metacognitive strategies in speaking learning.

Instrument and Procedure

This research used a questionnaire adapted from two instruments. The first is Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (1990), a widely used instrument that has been applied in various previous studies examining language learning strategies, including metacognitive strategies. The second is an instrument developed by Zhang et al. (2021), derived from the Strategic Competence Inventory for Computer-Assisted Speaking Assessment (SCICASA), which was specifically designed to capture learners' use of strategies during integrated speaking tasks. Items from both instruments were adapted and combined to represent the three stages of metacognitive strategies relevant to the context of this research: planning, monitoring, and evaluation. A total of 21 items were administered to students, divided into 7 questions for planning, 8 questions for monitoring, and 6 questions for evaluation. These items were translated into Indonesian and contextually adapted to ensure their relevance to the high school speaking classroom environment.

Individual interviews were conducted with 15 selected students to gain a deeper understanding of the factors influencing their predominant use of each stage of metacognitive strategies. Before the interviews, the researcher explained the purpose of the interviews to each participant and asked for their consent to audio-

record the sessions. Each interview lasted approximately 10–15 minutes and was conducted in Indonesian to ensure that the students could comfortably share their experiences without language barriers. The interview results were then transcribed, translated into English, and analyzed thematically.

Data Analysis

The Data obtained through the questionnaire was entered into the SILL results table to analyze the results by calculating the average use of the stages of metacognitive strategies used by students. The calculation of the average uses a formula adapted from SILL Oxford (1990). The formula is as follows:

Table 1. Categories Average of Metacognitive Strategy Stages

Level	Interpretation	Mean Score
High	Always or almost always used	4.5 to 5.0
	Usually used	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometimes used	2.5 to 3.4
Low	Generally not used	1.5 to 2.4
	Never or almost never used	1.0 to 1.4

(Oxford, 1990)

In addition, the researchers interviewed a number of selected students representing three levels of English proficiency (low, medium, and high). The interviews were conducted in two stages: the first stage to triangulate the questionnaire data by confirming the students' responses, and the second stage to explore the factors influencing students' frequent use of metacognitive strategies. The interview data were analyzed using the qualitative data analysis model proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994), which consists of data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions and verification. During the data reduction process, the interview transcripts were translated into English. The data were then reduced by selecting, coding, and categorizing data relevant to the factors influencing students' use of metacognitive strategies. The reduced data were then organized into descriptive narratives based on the themes that emerged to facilitate the identification of patterns, similarities, and differences among the participants' responses. Finally, conclusions were drawn by interpreting the relationships among the identified themes and were continuously verified by reviewing the interview data to ensure consistency and credibility. To protect participant confidentiality, interview quotes presented in the findings section are coded using the students' initials (e.g., VI, GR, JO).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research aimed to identify the dominant stage of metacognitive strategies used by students during speaking skill learning in the classroom and the factors

influencing it. To address this research objective, the researcher employed a questionnaire adapted from the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford (1990) and SCICASA by Zhang et al. (2021). The questionnaire, which consisted of 21 items using a 1–5 Likert scale, was distributed to students through an online platform. The results obtained from the questionnaire were transferred into tables and calculated using a formula adapted from the SILL by Oxford (1990). Subsequently, the calculation results were entered into a category table to determine which stages of metacognitive strategies were employed by the students. The following presents the results of the questionnaire calculations that have been categorized:

Table 2. Average Results of Metacognitive Strategy Stages

Metacognitive Stages	Mean	Level
Evaluation	3.81	Usually used (high)
Planning	3.79	Usually used (high)
Monitoring	3.65	Usually used (high)

The analysis shows that all three stages of metacognitive strategies fall into the "usually used" category based on Oxford's (1990) classification. This indicates that the eleventh-grade students employed all stages of metacognitive strategies at a relatively similar level. However, based on table 2, the evaluation stage recorded the highest average score ($M = 3.81$), only slightly higher than planning ($M = 3.79$). Given this very small difference, it may be more accurate to describe evaluation and planning as activities carried out in relatively equal measure, rather than considering evaluation to be a clearly more dominant activity than planning. In contrast, monitoring recorded a much lower average score ($M = 3.65$), indicating that students engaged in real-time monitoring lower than planning before speaking or evaluation after speaking.

The results of the questionnaire analysis indicate that students optimally utilized all three stages of the metacognitive strategy, with the evaluation stage being the most frequently used by students. This finding differs from previous research, which reported that evaluation was the least frequently used metacognitive stage (Dangin & Hartati, 2022; Fitrianingsih et al., 2025). This is because students more often check for their shortcomings after completing a task and evaluate their learning process. Furthermore, while the planning stage shows a slight difference compared to the evaluation stage, it remains the dominant stage, albeit with a different proportion. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that the planning stage is frequently used by students (Imran et al., 2026). This suggests that students tend to prepare the material they will present to deliver a flawless performance.

In contrast, the monitoring stage was the least frequently used. This finding differs from previous research, which found that the monitoring stage was the second most frequently used by students (Fitrianingsih et al., 2025). This finding suggests that students tend not to use the monitoring stage because they experience difficulties with it. At this stage, students are required to monitor their pronunciation, grammar,

word choice, and the content of their speech in real time, which requires more complex cognitive control than the planning or evaluating stages.

In general, the descriptive quantitative findings indicate that students frequently use all three stages of metacognitive strategies, with the Evaluation stage emerging as the most dominant, followed by the Planning and Monitoring stages. Although these findings illustrate the extent to which each stage of metacognitive strategies is used, they do not explain the factors influencing students' use of these strategies. Therefore, the interview findings serve as the primary data source to provide a deeper understanding of the factors influencing the dominance of each stage of metacognitive strategies among students.

Evaluation

The results of interviews with students indicate awareness of the need to address deficiencies in their speaking skills during the next lesson. Student IS, with medium English proficiency, states, "After the performance, I look at what was lacking in my previous performance so that it can be improved in the future." Through this evaluation process, students were able to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, enabling them to make improvements and achieve better performance in future speaking tasks. Another interview finding from IT students with high English proficiency stated, "So that my performance can be better in the future and I can become more confident". There is awareness among students to address deficiencies in their speaking skills during the next lesson. In addition, student FI, with low English proficiency, states, "Because I think evaluation is important, and it's also essential to evaluate yourself so you can figure out what's wrong and what's right." That statement indicates that, in the student's view, evaluation is important for identifying mistakes made during a speaking performance.

Other findings indicate that students predominantly use the evaluation stage because of the support they receive from teachers in the form of feedback provided after their speaking performances in class. These findings are supported by the results of interviews conducted with the students. Student KE, with high English proficiency, states, "If there are any mistakes in our speaking or something similar, the teacher usually provides suggestions or feedback so that we can do better and improve our performance". This statement shows that the teacher offered feedback in the form of guidance and corrective comments when students made errors in speaking performance.

In addition to corrective feedback, the teacher frequently provided positive reinforcement and appreciation after students completed their English-speaking performances. Students HA, with low English proficiency, state, "It was more of an appreciation because sometimes, if the teacher gives too many comments, it can make students lose their confidence". This statement indicates that teachers' appreciation increases students' self-confidence. As a result, the feedback not only

supported students' linguistic development but also enhanced their self-confidence in speaking English. In addition, student IS, with medium English proficiency, state, "The feedback the teacher gave me was mostly appreciation for my progress. There were also suggestions from the teacher, both on my strengths and weaknesses, that's all." This statement indicates that the teacher uses positive reinforcement before giving feedback, creating a supportive learning environment that helps students receive correction more positively.

The results of the interviews above indicate that the evaluation stage helped them improve their speaking skills in subsequent learning activities. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that evaluation fosters students' awareness of the effectiveness of their learning process (Fitrianingsih et al., 2025; Alfariy, 2022). Students' willingness to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses, identify areas for improvement, and use this evaluation to enhance their speaking skills in the future indicates that self-awareness plays a crucial role in encouraging students to engage in metacognitive evaluation during English language learning. In addition, the findings are also consistent with previous research showing that teacher feedback encourages students to evaluate both their learning process and their learning outcomes (Lai et al., 2025; Imran et al., 2026). This suggests that teachers serve as an external factor that encourages students to evaluate their performance after speaking. This feedback helps them identify their strengths and weaknesses, thereby enabling them to improve their performance in the future. Additionally, feedback in the form of praise can boost students' confidence in speaking English.

Planning

The interview findings revealed that the factor influencing the planning stage was student motivation. This was reinforced by a statement from student HA, who has low English proficiency, who said, "Of course, to get good grades, we also need to be seen by others. So, we really need planning." This statement indicates that students are motivated to earn good grades for their speaking performances. Another finding revealed that a factor influencing the use of the planning stage is students' desire to prepare the material before their performance. Student ZA, who has medium English proficiency, stated, "When I'm about to speak in English, in this case, during a presentation, I take notes first, then I also try to understand the material, not just memorize the text, but focus more on understanding." This indicates that the student applies the planning strategy by taking notes and understanding the material before speaking, in order to deliver better presentations. In addition, student KE, who has high English proficiency, stated, "So, what makes me personally prepare a plan before a performance is that it's primarily to ensure we don't just make random noises during the performance. That way, we know what we're supposed to do when we perform." This statement indicates that students engage in the planning stage so they can present their material in a structured manner and avoid speaking without a clear plan.

These findings support previous research showing that during the planning stage, students exhibit strong ambition and clear goals toward achieving learning objectives (Lai et al., 2025; Maharani et al., 2024). This ambition and clear goals encourage students to prepare more thoroughly before performing speaking tasks, thus making them feel more prepared and having a greater chance of achieving the desired outcomes. Other findings align with previous research, which reported that students habitually engage in the planning stage before performing (Imran et al., 2026). Preparation undertaken at this stage helps students organize material, structure the sequence of delivery, and enhance their preparedness for speaking activities. Therefore, the desire to prepare material can be seen as a factor that strengthens the use of planning stages, as students recognize that thorough preparation will help them deliver material more systematically, reduce errors during speaking, and improve the quality of their speaking performance. Therefore, motivation and readiness in preparing material complement each other in encouraging the use of planning stages, as both help students organize their thinking processes before speaking, resulting in a more structured, confident presentation that aligns with the desired communication goals.

Monitoring

The monitoring stage is the least frequently used stage by students this is due to several factors based on the students' experiences. In the interview results, student GR, with high English proficiency, stated, "if someone notices that my pronunciation is wrong, I sometimes go blank and think, 'Oh no, this is wrong'." This statement indicates that when students become aware that others have noticed their errors, they experience nervousness and a subsequent loss of self-confidence. In addition, student HR, with medium English proficiency, states, "I often feel nervous when I perform, and sometimes I mispronounce things. When I speak, my English gets lost, and the meaning is different. It makes me nervous and scared". This statement shows that the fear experienced by students causes mispronunciation.

This finding can be explained by the fact that monitoring occurs while students are speaking, requiring them to control their pronunciation, grammar, and message delivery simultaneously. When students become aware of their mistakes during this real-time process, they may experience communication anxiety, making it difficult to maintain concentration and continue speaking. This interpretation is supported by previous research finding that communication anxiety is negatively correlated with speaking performance, indicating that higher anxiety leads to poorer speaking performance (Dayag-Tungpalan, 2023). This anxiety prevents the use of effective monitoring stages because students focus more on their fear of making mistakes than on conveying their message. Therefore, although monitoring is an important metacognitive strategy for evaluating speaking performance, its implementation may be suboptimal when students experience high levels of anxiety.

CONCLUSION

This research concludes that eleventh-grade students actively use all three stages of metacognitive strategies, namely planning, monitoring, and evaluation, in learning English speaking skills. Evaluation was the most frequently used stage, driven by students' self-awareness to correct their shortcomings and by external support in the form of corrective feedback and appreciation from teachers. The planning stage is nearly as dominant as the evaluation stage, influenced by students' motivation to achieve good grades and their desire to prepare material in a structured manner to avoid mistakes during their presentations. Conversely, the monitoring stage is the least frequently used due to high levels of communication anxiety and nervousness experienced by students when they immediately realize their grammatical or pronunciation errors while speaking. Although this research provides valuable insights into students' metacognitive strategies, there are several limitations. This research relied solely on self-reported questionnaire data and interview data. It did not conduct direct observations of students' speaking performance during classroom speaking instruction. Additionally, this research had a limited number of participants and was conducted only in the context of a few classes at a single school.

As a practical implication, teachers are recommended to provide further support in the classroom. Practical recommendations for teachers are expected to create a learning environment that encourages reflection, provides targeted feedback. Teachers are also recommended to encourage students to engage in each stage of metacognitive strategies, such as providing guided reflection sheets, speaking checklists, peer feedback, and implementing pre-speaking planning activities. In addition to providing targeted feedback, these practices can contribute to the continuous development of English speaking skills. For future research, it is recommended to collect more comprehensive data. Further research could include direct classroom observations and the assessment of speaking performance scores to investigate more thoroughly whether the use of metacognitive strategies is indeed proven to improve students' speaking skills.

REFERENCES

- Alfarisy, F. (2022). The use of SILL Oxford on understanding the speaking learning strategies. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 5(6), 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.6.11>
- Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for teaching speaking in the English language classroom. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(1).
- Dangin, & Hartati, E. (2022). Students' metacognitive strategies awareness and speaking ability: A correlational research. *IJLECR: International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*, 8(1), 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.21009/IJLECR.081.05>

- Dayag-Tungpalan, M. L. (2023). Metacognitive strategies and perceived factors affecting the speaking performance of ESL learners. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.02.049>
- Fitrianingsih, Nasrullah, R., & Faridawati. (2025). EFL students' metacognitive strategies in learning speaking. *IDEAS Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2), 4716–4729. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.5898>
- Imran, F., Tawali, & Junmadil. (2026). Exploring metacognitive strategies in English language learning for non-language students. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education (JIME)*, 12(1), 2656–5862. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jime.v1i2.9983>
- John, E., Rangasamy, D., Indiran, D., Adickalam, E. R., Kashinathan, S., & Hashim, H. (2021). Language learning strategies used by Form 4 ESL learners to develop speaking skills. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v11-i6/10040>
- Kulsum, E. M., Jamjami, A. Y., Uyun, A. S., & Sri Widianingsih, A. W. (2025). A research on the difficulties in English speaking for EFL students. *Journal on Education*, 7(2), 10648–10659. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v7i2.8109>
- Lai, Q., Alias, B. S., & A. Hamid, A. H. (2025). Happy minds, effective learners: Investigating the impact of metacognitive strategies on foreign language enjoyment. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8391>
- Luviana, V., Jimad, W. O. V. N., & Suherman, L. O. A. (2022). Metacognitive strategy and its interplay towards speaking performance: A case in SMPN 29 Buton. *APLIKATIF: Journal of Research Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 84–94. <https://doi.org/10.59110/aplikatif.v1i1.67>
- Maharani, S. A., Samsudin, D., & Azizah, A. (2024). Strategi belajar dalam berpidato Bahasa Korea: Studi kasus pada mahasiswa berprestasi di lingkungan Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Korea. *EduInovasi: Journal of Basic Educational Studies*, 4(2), 1071–1087. <https://doi.org/10.47467/edu.v4i2.3000>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Sari, R. F., Wageyono, & Wangi, W. (2021). An analysis of students' English oral communication of English Educational Department, PGRI University of Banyuwangi. *LUNAR*, 4(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.36526/ln.v4i2.1458>
- Silaban, R., Sihombing, F., Panjaitan, T. JT., Silaban, L., & Ginting, M. O. (2025). Improving students' English speaking skills through collaborative learning at Anastasya School Medan. *Dst*, 5(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.47709/dst.v5i1.6366>
- Zhang, W., Zhang, L. J., & Wilson, A. J. (2021). Supporting learner success: Revisiting strategic competence through developing an inventory for

computer-assisted speaking assessment. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689581>